

## **RESCISSON OF AUTOGRAPH NOTICE AND NULLIFICATION OF PLEA STATEMENT FOR CAUSE**

Notice Date: This: January 18th of the year Two Thousand Twenty Five.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
U.S. DISTRICT ATTORNEYS  
970 Broad St. Suite 700  
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07102

In reply to: Fraudulently induced "Plea statement regarding Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks" # 19-cr-877 (CCC)-03, Dated 09/24/2020, that was used to maliciously, unlawfully and illegally embondage, torture and de-wealth rescissioner for years.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE: i, Jobadiah-Sinclair: Weeks, a sentient moral man, Settler of JSW Trust, Secure Party Creditor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (Beneficiary/accused) **Rescission** the Autograph as it appears on the "Plea statement regarding JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS # 19-cr-877 (CCC)-03, Dated 09/24/2020, that was never signed and that was intended for a person. That induced statement was used to maliciously, unlawfully and illegally embondage, torture and de-wealth rescissioner, a third party victim, for years. This Rescission shall include every Autograph on every document, copy, bearing autograph, "Jobadiah Weeks", for cause.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE: i, Jobadiah-Sinclair: Weeks, a sentient moral man, **Rescission** the autograph on ANY and ALL document(s) obtained, held, kept, filed, used, sent, received, archived, copied, duplicated, submitted or whatall.

Rescissioner willingly, knowingly, voluntarily, intentionally and intelligently perform this act and deed.

Rescissioner made a mistake by autographing "Jobadiah Weeks" in the stead of a person listed on the document by the name of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS who he was/is not. The name on the document was similar and rescissioner inadvertently autographed in the place of that person.

Rescissioner made a mistake Providing Information, Autographing, or Acknowledging the "Plea statement regarding JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS" # 19-cr-877 (CCC)-03, Dated 09/24/2020, that was used to maliciously, unlawfully and illegally embondage, torture and de-wealth rescissioner for years.

"Plea statement regarding Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks" # 19-cr-877 (CCC)-03, Dated 09/24/2020, that was fraudulently induced and was intended to perpetrate a fraud and **is Fraud** and therefore VOID.

Rescissioner received NO value or consideration from "Plea statement regarding JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS" # 19-cr-877 (CCC)-03, Dated 09/24/2020 and therefore **no contract could be made valid**.

Therefore, i now repent of my sin.

"My son, if you: Have you become guarantor for your friend, Have shaken hands in a pledge for a stranger, Have been snared by the words of your own mouth, Have been caught by the words of your own mouth - Do this at once, my son, and deliver yourself, For you have come into the hand of your friend.<sup>1</sup> Go, humble yourself, and urge your friend. Give no sleep to your eyes, Nor slumber to your eyelids. Deliver yourself like a gazelle from the hunter's hand, And like a bird from the hand of the trapper."<sup>2</sup>

"He who is guarantor for a stranger suffers harm, But one who hates shaking hands in a pledge is safe."

---

<sup>1</sup> Proverbs 6 verses 1 through 5, The Scriptures, published by Institute For Scripture Research (PTY) LTD South Africa P.O. Box 1830 North riding 2162 South Africa

<sup>2</sup> Proverbs 11 verse 15, The Scriptures, published by Institute For Scripture Research (PTY) LTD South Africa P.O. Box 1830 North riding 2162 South Afri

**NOTICE TO CLERK NOTICE TO RECORDER**

**Pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C., chapter 101 2071(b),** "Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, recording or another thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both and shall forfeit his office and he shall be disqualified from holding any office under tHE UNITED sTATES."

**NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL AND NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT**

Law and Equity provide for rescission for mistake of the fact or actual or constructive fraud, and voidance where the fraud is the determining motive of the contract to wit in pertinent part:

rescission.... A party's unilateral unmaking of a contract for a legally sufficient reason.. Rescission is generally available as a remedy or defense for a non-defaulting party and restores the parties to their pre-contractual positions.. [Blacks Law Dictionary, ed., s.v. "Rescission"] (U/L emphasis added)

rescission.. and act of rescinding, annulling, or vacating or of canceling or abrogating (as by restoring to another party to a contract or transaction that one has received from him). [Merriam-Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, inc. version 2.5., s.v. "Rescission"]

RECISSION. The equity for the rescission and cancellation of agreements, deeds and other instruments arise when a transaction is vitiated by illegality or fraud, or by reason of it's having been carried on in ignorance or mistake of facts material to its operation. The Jurisdiction of equity is exercised upon the principle the *quia timet*; that is, for fear that such agreements, securities, deeds and other instruments may be voraciously or injuriously used against the party seeking relief, when the evidence to impeach them may be lost; or that they may throw a cloud or suspicion over his interest or title; or where he has a defense good and equity which cannot be made available at law. The cases in which this relief will be granted on account of the misrepresentation and fraud may be divided into four classes: *first*, where there is actual fraud in the party defendant in which the party plaintiff has not participated; Smith v. Richards, 13 pet. (U.S. 26, 10 L. Ed. 42); *secondly*, where there is constructive fraud against public policy and the party plaintiff does not appear to have participated therein; *thirdly*, where there is a fraud against public policy and the party plaintiff has participated therein, but public policy would be defeated by allowing it to stand; *fourthly*, where there is a constructive fraud by both parties, - that is, we're both parties are *in delicto*, but not *in para delicto*; see 2 Story, Eq. Jur. § 694... [Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 3rd rev., 8th cd., s.v. "Rescission"]

FRAUD.. *Actual* or positive *fraud* includes cases of the intentional and successful employment of any cunning, deception, or artifice, used to circumvent, cheat, or deceive another.. 1 Story Eq. Jur. § 186.

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

COMES NOW, Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks©, with this common law **NOTICE AND DEMAND: Notice of and rescission of Plea Bargain For cause.** To be placed before the Clerk of Court of The District Court of tHE UNITED sTATES District of NEW JERSEY on this nineteenth day of the eleventh month In the Year of Our Lord twenty naught twenty four.

ATTORNEY GENERAL - NEW JERSEY  
Attn: MATTHEW J. PLATKIN  
25 Market Street  
Trenton, New Jersey, 08625

Via USPS 7022333000073301530  
R.R. 959094023377227867216

U.S. DISTRICT COURT NEWARK - NEW JERSEY

Attn: CLAIR C. CECCHI  
Attn: EDWARD S. KEIL  
Attn: MICHAEL A. HAMMER  
50 Walnut Street  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Via USPS 9589071052702257516317  
R.R. 9590940233777227867247

STATE OF NEW JERSEY Inc.  
125 West State Street  
Trenton, New Jersey, 08608

Via USPS 9589071052702257516638  
R.R. 9590940233777227867230

U.S. PROSECUTORS/ATTORNEYS - NEW JERSEY

Attn: CRAIG CARPENITO  
Attn: PHILIP R. SELLINGER  
Attn: ANTHONY P. TORNTORE  
Attn: DAVID W. FEDER  
Attn: RACHAEL HONIG  
Attn: JAMIE L. HOXIE  
Attn: JOSEPH A. MINISH  
Attn: SARAH DEVLIN  
970 Broad Street  
7th Floor  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Via USPS 9589071052702257515211  
R.R. 9590940291454225601403

B.A.R. ASSOCIATION - NEW JERSEY  
One Constitution Square  
New Brunswick, New Jersey, 08901

Via USPS 9589071052702257516621  
R.R. 9590940233777227867223

**CONCLUSION AND *RECTUM ROGARE***

WHEREAS, the facts and the law contained herein are before this court; and. WHEREAS, the facts and the law contained herein are the Truth; and WHEREAS, we hold said Truths to be self-evident; and, WHEREAS, self-evident Truths are undisputed and incontrovertible, no oral argument is requested, for no words can alter or overcome these Truths; and, WHEREAS, Truth is Sovereign: She comes from God and bears His message, from whatever quarter her great eyes may look down upon you; Psalms 117:2; John 8:32; II Corinthians. 13:8; THEREFORE; this court must perform its duty under the Rule of Law, do Justice, *Rectum Rogare*, without delay for.. "Justice delayed is Justice denied."

*Rectum Rogare* - "to do right; to petition the judge to do right." — Black's Law Dictionary 4th edition.

"i, a man commonly known as Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks© (Rescissioner), on my own unlimited commercial liability, certify that I have read the above and do know that the facts contained are true, correct and complete, not misleading, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth."

**Attachment:** "Plea statement regarding JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS" # 19-cr-877 (CCC)-03, Dated 09/24/2020, that was fraudulently induced and was intended to perpetrate a fraud and is fraud and therefore VOID.

Sincerely: Jobadiah Weeks

Jobadiah-Sinclair: Weeks©  
Without Prejudice UCC 1-308 A.A.R.

Jobadiah-Sinclair: of the family Weeks (the living man)  
On the land of the republic at Large, America  
Non-Domestic  
c/o 11627 West 74th Way  
near Arvada, Colorado Republic [80005]  
without the United States (28 U.S.C. 1746)

### Acknowledgment

For verification purposes only:

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me by Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks©, known to me or proven to me to be the real man signing this affidavit this 13th day of February, 2024


WITNESS my hand and official seal:

Annik Joy Burnett

NOTARY PUBLIC

02/13/2025

DATE



Notarial Act performed by Audio-Video Communication.

Jobadiah-Sinclair: of the family Weeks (the living man)  
**On the land** of the county at Large, Jefferson  
 Non-Domestic  
 c/o 11627 w74th Way  
 near Arvada, Colorado Republic [80005]  
 Without the United States (28 U.S.C. 1746)

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

United States of America  
 Plaintiff

v.

MATTHEW BRENT GOETTCHE,  
 RUSS ALBERT MEDLIN,  
 JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS,  
 JOSEPH FRANK ABEL, and  
 SILVIU CATALIN BALACI

Hon. Claire C. Cecchi  
 CUSIP attaching number  
 CC 19-CR-877-NJ-CECCHI  
 CC 9:19-MJ-8526

NOTICE OF AFFIDAVIT,  
 INTRODUCTION OF NEW EVIDENCE,  
 CHALLENGE OF JURISDICTION, RESCISSION  
 OF MY AUTOGRAPH MAKING THE PLEA  
 VOID, COUNTER CLAIM, INVOICE, WRIT OF  
 QUO WARRANTO, AND DEMAND TO DISMISS  
 PETITIONER FROM CASE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	1
TABLE OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION.....	10
2. NOTICE OF RESCISSION OF PLEA STATEMENT .....	15
3. Exhibit 1: PETITION TO DISMISS PETITIONER FROM CASE .....	26
3.1. There is no standing to join me to the conspiracy.	28
3.2. Defective Indictment Re Petitioner	35
3.3. Government Fabricated Alleged Conspiracy Theory to Sell Unregistered “Securities” under 18 U.S.C. §371	41
3.4. Exculpatory Tax Returns in Re. 26 U.S.C. §7201 Government Fabricated Guilty Plea	51
4. WRIT OF QUO WARRANTO AGAINST THE UNLAWFULLY CREATED RES/CIVIL STATUS WHO IS THE TARGET OF THIS ENFORCEMENT ACTION .....	56
5. SECOND CLARIFICATION OF WORD “DEFENDANT”.....	60
6. SECOND NOTICE OF SERVICE MARK INFRINGEMENT.....	63
7. EXPLANATION OF WHY CIVIL STATUTORY STATUSES SUCH AS “PERSON” ARE PUBLIC OFFICERS .....	64
8. CONCLUSIONS.....	68
9. AFFIRMATION .....	74

## TABLE OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Provisions	
2nd Amendment .....	32
5th Amendment .....	51
6th Amendment .....	30
Art. III.....	60, 61
Article 1, Section 10.....	71
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2.....	31, 57
Article 4, Section 4.....	65
Article III.....	23
Bill of Rights .....	51
Constitution .....	39, 62
Declaration of Independence.....	54, 62
Fifth Amendment.....	54
First Amendment .....	54, 66, 67
The Federalist No. 51 (1788), James Madison.....	19
Thirteenth Amendment.....	16, 24, 27, 54, 56, 66
 Statutes	
1 U.S.C. §204 .....	42, 49
15 U.S.C. §§77e and 77x.....	36
15 U.S.C. §77b(a)(2).....	16, 26, 27, 52, 53
15 U.S.C. §77x .....	16, 28
15 U.S.C. §77b(a)(1).....	38
15 U.S.C. §§77b(1) or 78c(a)(10).....	41
15 U.S.C. §77c(a)(10).....	38
18 U.S.C. § 1652 .....	27
18 U.S.C. § 1661 .....	27
18 U.S.C. §1028 .....	15
18 U.S.C. §1583 .....	16
18 U.S.C. §1589(a)(3).....	16
18 U.S.C. §1590 .....	16
18 U.S.C. §1622 .....	69
18 U.S.C. §201 .....	55, 56
18 U.S.C. §2381 .....	63
18 U.S.C. §3 .....	15, 55, 56
18 U.S.C. §371 .....	16, 19, 26, 28, 29, 36, 48, 55, 56
18 U.S.C. §4 .....	15, 55, 56
18 U.S.C. §654 .....	31
18 U.S.C. §912 .....	16, 22, 27, 31, 53, 56
18 U.S.C. 1519 .....	14
18 USC section 3231 .....	50
26 U.S.C. §6041(a).....	55

26 U.S.C. §6531 .....	47
26 U.S.C. §7201 .....	16, 26, 28, 47, 66
26 U.S.C. §7201: Attempt to evade or defeat tax.....	47
26 U.S.C. §7343 .....	16, 26, 52, 53
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(1).....	27
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26).....	55, 57, 58, 61
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) .....	17, 26, 64
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B) .....	60
26 U.S.C. §872 .....	49
26 U.S.C. 3121(e).....	17, 18
28 U.S.C. §2201 .....	56
28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A).....	57
4 U.S.C. §110(d).....	64
4 U.S.C. §72 .....	22, 27, 53, 56, 58
44 U.S.C. §1505(a).....	57
44 U.S.C. 1505 (a) (1) .....	49
5 U.S.C. §3331 .....	54
5 U.S.C. §553(a)(2).....	57
5 U.S.C. 553 (a) (1) .....	49
5 U.S.C. 553 (a) (2).....	49
8 U.S.C. §1101 .....	11
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) .....	11
California Civil Code Section 2224 .....	27
I.R.C. §871(a).....	48
Internal Revenue Code .....	58
Judicial Code of 1940.....	30
Patriot Act.....	40
Public Law 80-772 .....	49
Real ID Act.....	40
Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), 42 U.S.C. Chapter 21B .....	67
Revenue Act of 1921 .....	27
Securities Act.....	41
Statutes at Large .....	62
Statutes At Large .....	62
Title 15 .....	24, 42, 54
Title 18 .....	66
Title 26 .....	49, 51, 54, 57, 66
Title 28 .....	30
Title 31 .....	51
Title 5 .....	55
Title 5 of the U.S. Code.....	54
Titles 26 and 15 .....	11
U.C.C. §1-308 .....	71
U.C.C. §2-104(1).....	27
U.S. Code Title 18 .....	58

U.S. Code Title 26.....	57
-------------------------	----

## Cases

Adickes v. Kress & Co., 398 U.S. 144, 157-158, n. 16.....	13
Alexander v. Bosworth (1915), 26 C.A. 589, 599, 147 P.607.....	28
Anderson v. Trueman, 100 Fla. 727, 130 So. 12, 13 .....	57
Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936).....	56
Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm'n, 430 U.S. 442, 450, n. 7, 97 S.Ct. 1261, 1266, n. 7, 51 L.Ed.2d. 464 (1977).....	60
Barrios & Co. v. Pettigrew (G. V.) Co. (1924), 68 C.A. 139, 228 P. 676.....	28
Bond v. United States; No. 09-1227 (2011). .....	50
Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742, 748.....	52
Brandeis Rules.....	56
Brown v. Keene, 8 Pet. 112, 115 (1834).....	26
Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S., at 122, 96 S.Ct., at 683 .....	60
Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325 .....	54
City of Boerne v. Flores Archbishop of San Antonio, 521 U.S. 507 (1997).....	42
Clark v. United States, 95 U.S. 539 (1877) .....	52
Clinton vs. City of New York, 524 U.S. 417 (1998) .....	50
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979) .....	54
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10 .....	55
Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 (1924).....	18
Crowell v. Benson, supra, 285 U.S., at 50-51, 52 S.Ct., at 292 .....	60
Crowell v. Benson, supra, at 51, 52 S.Ct., at 292 .....	60
Curtin v. State, 61 Cal.App. 377, 214 P. 1030, 1035 .....	58
Davis v. Beason, 133 U.S. 333, 342, 10 S.Ct. 299, 300 .....	12
Deckebach v. La Vida Charters, Inc., Fed. Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P. 94182, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 4182, 867 F.2d. 278, Fed.Sec.L. Rep. (CCH) ¶ 94182, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P94182, 1989 U.S.App. LEXIS 805 (6th Cir. 1989).....	41
Economy Plumbing & Heating v. United States, 470 F.2D. 585 (1972).....	24
Electric Co. v. Dow, 166 U.S. 489, 17 S.Ct. 645, 41 L.Ed. 1088.....	56
Ex parte Bakelite Corp., supra, at 451, 49 S.Ct., at 413 .....	60
Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935) (Cardozo, J.) .....	55
Gonzales v. Buist (04/01/12) 224 U.S. 126, 56 L. Ed. 693, 32 S. Ct. 463 .....	13
Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General, 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527 .....	56
Great Western Bank & Trust v. Kotz, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P 95494, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 5494, 532 F.2d. 1252, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 95494, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P95494, 1976 U.S.App. LEXIS 12283 (9th Cir. 1976).....	41
Hale v. Henke~ 201 U.S. 43, 74 (1906) .....	37
Holt v. United States (10/31/10) 218 U.S. 245, 54 L.Ed. 1021, 31 S.Ct. 2 .....	13
Hooven Allison v. Evatt, 324 US 652 (1945).....	63
Howell v. War Finance Corporation, C.C.A.Ariz., 71 F.2d 237, 243 .....	57
In re Bolens 135 N.W. Rep. 164 (1912).....	24
In re Brock, 312 Pa. 92, 166 A. 778, 781 .....	57
Investment Co. Institute v. Camp, 274 F.Supp. 624, 1967 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9343 (D.D.C. 1967) , rev'd, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 2438, 420 F.2d. 83, 136 U.S.App.D.C. 241, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P92438 (D.C. Cir. 1969) .....	38
Lacey v. State, 13 Ala.App. 212, 68 So. 706, 710.....	58

Leonard v. Vicksburg, etc., R. Co., 198 U.S. 416, 422, 25 S.Ct. 750, 49 L.Ed. 1108.....	56
License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866).....	58, 62, 65
Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 (1922) .....	24
Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 112 S.Ct. 2130, 119 L.Ed.2d. 351 (1992).....	24
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) .....	42
Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484 (1987).....	54
Miller Brother Co. vs Maryland 347 U.S. 340 (1954) .....	26
Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. 162 (1874) .....	11
Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876).....	27
Murdock vs Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105 .....	58
Neuwirth Inv. Fund, Ltd. v. Swanton, 422 F.Supp. 1187, 1975 U.S.Dist. LEXIS 15255 (D.N.Y. 1975) .....	41
Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d 1097, 1100 .....	54
Newman-Green v. Alfonxo Larrain, 490 U.S. 826 (1989) .....	26
Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. 50, 102 S.Ct. 2858 (1983).....	61
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928).....	65
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928).....	19
Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 714 (1878) .....	23
People v. Ridgley, 21 Ill. 65, 1859 WL 6687, 11 Peck 65 (Ill., 1859) .....	61
Pierce v. Somerset Ry., 171 U.S. 641, 648, 19 S.Ct. 64, 43 L.Ed. 316 .....	56
Ricker's Petition, 66 N.H. 207 (1890) .....	61
Robertson v. Cease, 97 U.S. 646, 648-649 (1878) .....	26
SEC v. Shiner, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P 92430, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 2430, 268 F.Supp.2d. 1333, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 92430, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P92430, 2003 U.S.Dist.LEXIS 15606 (S.D.Fla. 2003).....	38
Shelmadine v. City of Elkhart, 75 Ind.App. 493, 129 N.E. 878.....	58
Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham Alabama, 373 U.S. 262 .....	59
Silverthorne Lumber Co. v. United States, 251 U.S. 385 (1920).....	16
St. Louis Malleable Casting Co. v. Prendergast Construction Co., 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351 .....	56
State ex rel. Colorado River Commission v. Frohmiller, 46 Ariz. 413, 52 P.2d. 483, 486.....	58
State v. Brennan, 49 Ohio.St. 33, 29 N.E. 593 .....	58
Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000) .....	55
Telephone Cases, Dolbear v. American Bell Telephone Company (03/19/88) 126 U.S. 1, 31 L.Ed. 863, 8 S.Ct. 778 .....	13
The Antelope, 23 U.S. 66, 10 Wheat 66, 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825) .....	19
Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C.Pa. 1964, 229 F.Supp. 647 .....	13
U.S v. Dougherty, 473 F.2d. 1113 (1972) .....	70
U.S. v. Macintosh, 283 U.S. 605 (1931) .....	12
United States v. Lovasco (06/09/77) 431 U.S. 783, 97 S. Ct. 2044, 52 L. Ed. 2d 752 .....	13
United States v. Sullivan, 274 U.S. 259 (1927).....	27
Walker v. Rich, 79 Cal.App. 139, 249 P. 56, 58 .....	58
Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U.S. 407, 411, 412, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229 .....	56
Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990) .....	19
Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945) .....	55
Yaselli v. Goff, C.C.A., 12 F.2d. 396, 403, 56 A.L.R. 1239 .....	58
Yick Wo vs Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886) .....	70

## Other Authorities

“The District of Criminals” .....	65
“The Matrix” Movie.....	59
(CFR) Counsel for Foreign Relations .....	44
1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83 .....	18
1040NR .....	48, 49
1040NR Attachment, Section 6, Items 1 through 3.....	49
2000 mules .....	69
2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992).....	55
7 Bac. Abr. 280.....	61
7 Corpus Juris Secundum Legal Encyclopedia (C.J.S.) Attorney & Client, § 4 .....	57
Affidavit of Material Facts .....	11
Alexander Hamilton .....	70
Andrew Jackson .....	66
Are you an idiot? .....	63
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 11 .....	44
BATF (Duns and Bradstreet #132282310).....	32
Ben Franklin said .....	40
Bilderberg .....	44
Bitcoin .....	32, 33, 34, 42, 46
Bitfury .....	33
Bitmain .....	33
Black’s Law Dictionary.....	57
Black’s Law Dictionary, 4th Edition .....	57
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1235.....	58
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1235.....	52
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581 .....	55
Blackrock .....	43
Blue Beam .....	44
Bohemian Grove .....	44
Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856.....	18
Carth. 479 .....	61
Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052.....	22, 59
Congress .....	62
Congressman Beccera .....	51
Congressman Ron Paul .....	32
Continuity of Government .....	44
Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #05.001 .....	55
Daniel Hale.....	45
Davos.....	44
Department of Injustice .....	33, 40
Department of the Treasury .....	51
Dept. Homeland Security (Duns & Bradstreet #932394187) .....	40
Dig. 50, 17, 69 .....	18
Docket 148 .....	47
EPA (Duns & Bradstreet # 057944910) .....	44

Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(c).....	29
Federal Reserve .....	18
FEDERAL RESERVE.....	46
FEDERAL RESERVE (Duns & Bradstreet #001959410).....	46
Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.....	39
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 60 (b) (4).....	50
Form 1040 .....	62
Form 1040NR.....	62
Former IRS Commissioner Steven Miller.....	51
Former IRS Commissioner Steven Miller and Congressman Beccera both admit that the income tax is "voluntary" .....	51
Friedrich Hayek.....	67
Fruit of a Poisonous Tree Doctrine .....	16
George Washington .....	63
Hacking Democracy .....	69
Homeland Security.....	40
House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5, 1933 .....	65
How State Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax, Form #08.024.....	48
HR 3190 (June 25th 1948) .....	49
Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027 .....	27, 59
Invisible Ballots.....	69
Iran, (a state sponsor of terrorism) .....	45
IRS (Duns & Bradstreet #040539587).....	51
IRS Commissioner .....	51
IRS Form 1040 .....	48, 68
IRS Form 1040NR .....	48
IRS Forms 1099, W-2, and 1042-S .....	55
IRS Fraud and Deception About the Statutory Word "Person" .....	28
jobadiah s. weeks.....	57
jobadiah sinclair weeks .....	59
JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS.....	56
JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS trust.....	11
JOBADIAH WEEKS (trust) .....	23, 70
JOBADIAH WEEKS TRUST .....	36, 59
Joby .....	57
John Wingate Weeks, Secretary of War.....	44
Joseph Goebbel's, head of Nazi propaganda .....	40
Judge Andrew Napolitano .....	62
Katz, Federal Legislative Courts, 43 Harv.L.Rev. 894, 917-918 (1930).....	60
Kore Rowe.....	45
KYC rules.....	28
Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives .....	30
Lawfully Avoiding Government Obligations Course, Form #12.040 .....	24
Legislative Branch.....	60
Loose Change 911 .....	45
Ludwig Von Mises.....	67

Mark Twain .....	65
Merriam Webster Dictionary: Anarchy .....	66
Microsoft .....	47
Milk Duds.....	69
Milton Freedman .....	67
Modern Money Mechanics.....	39
Money Laundering Enforcement SCAM, Form #05.044 .....	25
Murray Rothbard .....	67
National Security Memorandum 200 .....	44
Nobel Peace Prize.....	44
Nord stream pipeline .....	44
Operation Northwoods .....	40
Presentment Clause, Art. I, § 7, cl. 2 .....	50
President John F. Kennedy .....	46
Presidents Harding and Coolage .....	44
Private Membership Agreement (PMA) .....	42
Private Membership Association (PMA) .....	18
probation officer .....	21
Problems with Atheistic Anarchism, Form #08.020 .....	66
Proof That There Is a “Straw Man”, Form #05.042.....	17
Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty, Form #08.018 .....	20
REX 84.....	44
Richard Haas and Henry Kissinger .....	44
Roosevelt's Executive Orders 6073, 6102, 6111, and 6260 .....	65
Sam Bankman-Fried.....	43, 45
SEC (Duns & Bradstreet #003475175).....	42
Separation of Powers Doctrine.....	30
SIXTIETH CONGRESS. Sess. II. CHs. 320, 321. – 1909.....	50
Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016 .....	67
Sometimes People Won't Name Things Just So They Don't Become Real.....	60
Stalin.....	69
The Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302 .....	51
The Money Scam .....	18
The Report from Iron Mountain .....	44
Thomas Jefferson .....	66
U.S. Attorney .....	12
U.S. Government.....	38
U.S. Inc.....	18
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) .....	59
U.S. Supreme Court .....	23
Uncounted .....	69
United Nations (Duns & Bradstreet #824777304).....	41
US Department of Justice (DOJ) (Duns & Bradstreet #011669674) .....	43
US Gov. Printing Office .....	49
USA Inc .....	40, 43

Vatican.....	44
Vice Admiral Darce E. Crandall.....	63
Voltaire .....	52
W.H.O. (Duns & Bradstreet # 618736326) .....	44
W-8SUB .....	48
What Happened to Justice? .....	30
Why It is Illegal for You to Enforce Money Laundering Statute in my Specific Case, Form #06.046 .....	25
Why It's a Crime for a Private state national to File a 1040 Income Tax Return, Form #08.021 .....	48, 68
William Colby, CIA Director .....	45
Writ of Quo Warranto.....	53
Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008.....	28
 Scriptures	
1 Cor. 7:23 .....	24
1 John 2:15 .....	67
1 Sam. 14:24.....	11
1 Sam. 8:4-20 .....	12
1 Tim. 6:10 .....	19
Abednego .....	67
biblical trust indenture.....	67
Daniel .....	67
Devil .....	67
Eph. 5:11 .....	21
Exodus 20:19.....	34
Exodus 22:7.....	27
God .....	21, 22, 24, 26, 34, 41, 56, 57, 65, 66, 67
Hosea 4:6.....	66
Isaiah 1:23 .....	46
Jesus .....	23
John 15:19 .....	67
Kingdom of Heaven .....	53, 67
Mark 13:11 .....	22
Matt. 23 .....	23
Matt. 5:11 .....	10
Matt. 6:24 .....	54
Meshach .....	67
Prov. 29:26 .....	65
Prov. 3:30 .....	19
Psalm 2:12 .....	22
Rev. 18:4.....	67
Rev. 18:6.....	27
Satan .....	22, 67
Shadrach .....	67
Yeshua .....	66

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1. I want to let judge know that these notices are the first I have ever written. I appreciate the leniency for not holding me to the standard of a BAR attorney. I don't speak the your "legalese" language. I don't understand any of it. However, I do stand under God's law and in his kingdom. I'm not schooled at your "law". I'm not a BAR attorney. (Which I have discovered through years of research is actually a foreign agent of the crown) I've tried my best to site as much of your law and precedent as I could find to prove a point. That I can beat you persecutors at your own game even though in reality, its not necessary because the Constitution, due process and the common law trumps your statutes/codes/procedures anyways. I'm doing this as truthfully and respectfully as I can for the record. Millions of people will read this brief. I am exercising as well as retaining and preserving ALL rights without waiving any rights, defenses, Common Law/Exclusive Equity, natural, private commercial, incorporeal, statutory or procedural, a natural living man, being of majority status conducting the style condition of **The Principle and Beneficial Equitable Title Holder**, and not an infant/miner or ward of the court do file this brief **without accepting any jurisdiction**, for I have neither committed any injury nor has any living man or woman true party in interest testified or witnessed that I have. Being of lawful majority age, clear head, and sound mind represent myself "in Propria Persona" (I'm my person) or "proper", which qualifies me as an attorney in fact, according to Black's Law Dictionary. Heretofore Asserting my right to present myself in legal matters establishes my status as my own attorney. To proceed in Pro Per means that the court cannot impose the same standards upon me as are imposed on a so-called licensed BAR member Attorney. To the prosecutors reading this, I have forgiven you for the horrible things you have put me and my family through these past several years. I don't mind being persecuted by you, because the Bible/Scriptures says that's the best way (God) Yahavah/Yahuah (Yah), the creator of the universe, can bless me: is to be persecuted by evil people. (Matt. 5:11). I thank the persecutors for heaping God's blessings upon me by falsely accusing me of breaking victimless statutes that I'm not subject to and then throwing me, an innocent man, in jail, without first having a jury convict me of a crime at trial. You should be ashamed of yourselves for violating my due process rights as the Constitution demands. You have broken the law. The Bible says that law breaking cheaters will one day pay for their crimes. You cant escape the karma that is coming for you.

- This document therefore represents my best attempt to write a solid and legally sound notice that gets the judge to dismiss this case. Since this case is classified as "complex" and the prosecution team has had over 5 years to build their case against myself and Bitclub, then that means they have plenty of time to read this notice carefully, several times over if need be. The length of this notice should not be an issue at all because, like they say, it's a complex case. No more "speedy trial time clock" to worry about they say. It took me far longer to write this notice than it will take for you to read it. Please print it out, read it slowly so you can digest what I'm saying.

Skimming will not suffice. This will probably be the most compelling notice you have ever read. Comprehension of what I'm saying is key. By the end of it, you will question everything you have ever been taught and everything you believe to be true. You may even be a little upset by how compartmentalized your education is with regards to the actual law.

First things first. Consider this scenario. If the police came and arrested you. You would probably ask, "What are the charges?" If they told you that they were bringing you in and that you were getting a "court martial" and you needed to take it up with the military tribunal. The first thing you would probably say is, "Wait a second, you can't court martial me, I never joined the military in the first place! I never signed any enlistment papers! I'm not subject to the military's jurisdiction! You MUST let me go!" Obviously, in a just world, you would have the charges that were brought against you dropped, right? Well, now you know what I expect to hear the judge say after reading this notice. "**Case Dismissed, you are free to go.**"

The purpose of this notice is to:

- A. Withdraw/Rescission the illegally compelled plea statement that was agreed to under duress and coercion.
- B. Dismiss the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS trust/office from this case so I the living man can be let alone.
- C. Rebut false allegations by the Plaintiff so everyone knows that I harmed no one and broke no laws that I'm subject to.
- D. Shift the burden of proof to the Prosecution through this rebuttal of these false allegations.
  - i. After 5 years of this persecution, the government has yet to produce a living/breathing injured party. I've never met my accuser. Why? Because my actions didn't create any victims.
  - ii. Also, the government hasn't produced the contract that I agreed to which comes with obligations. Why? Because there isn't a contract. And even if they were to produce a contract, I would challenge the validity of an obligation by contract or operation of law on the basis of the lack of full disclosure and/or information on the face of the alleged instrument.
  - iii. I don't have to prove my innocence, the burden of proof is on the government, however, proving my innocence is easy. All I really have to do is show the court that there is no injured party and there is no contract in existence between myself and the State. Below you will see me rebutting all the government's presumptions. Thus making it easy for the judge to dismiss me from this case.
- 2. Throughout this pleading I specifically ask that the Prosecution/Plaintiff and even the court remain SILENT on every fact stated herein that they agree with pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6), since this demand is submitted with Memorandums of Law throughout and a signed Affidavit of Material Facts by a federally protected witness, being myself. I can invoke "federal civil rules" in this quasi-criminal case because there is a predicate civil status of "person" for both

charges that I was forced to plead guilty to under criminal duress. See the first couple words and their definitions of each of the statutes that I supposedly violated later in section 3.1. As you will see, it has nothing to do with me the living man.

3. Remember that the common law is above anything the legislature produces. And because of the separation of powers between the judicial and legislative branches, The Supreme Court said recently (2024) in the *SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION v. JARKESY* page 42-44 of 98 [https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/23pdf/22-859\\_1924.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/23pdf/22-859_1924.pdf) that congress can't change what due process means. The constitution prevents you, judge, from using statutes when it comes to violating my rights. The common law is distinguished from the legislature, and you are NOT allowed to use legislative powers. My due process rights were violated. You must dismiss this case!
4. This unjust action is being undertaken under the guise of "public protection", but there are no members of the public that I am aware of who have actually complained about any choices of action or action I have made in any aspect of this case. I will show later in section 3.1 that because no injuries traceable to any of my actions or choices, the government has no standing to join me to this case and there cannot be a "conspiracy".

Furthermore, since citizenship and nationality came up in our previous dealings, I'd like to clarify for the record that I am a member of we "the People", I.e. A "U.S. National" per 22 C.F.R. §51.1 and a "national" per 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21). I am NOT an 8 USC 1401 "US CITIZEN". However, the allegiance mentioned in the definition is merely presumed. As the U.S. Supreme Court pointed out in *Minor v. Happersett*, 88 U.S. 162 (1874), "*Allegiance and protection [by the government from harm] are, in this connection, reciprocal obligations. The one is a compensation for the other; allegiance for protection and protection for allegiance.*" HOWEVER, the term "permanent" in 8 U.S.C. §1101, in the phrase "permanent allegiance" depends on my consent and I withdrew that consent by formal notice to the government years ago precisely because of the ongoing money mania and corruption that been evidenced in this case. By withdrawing consent to be protected, in effect, I withdrew YOUR RIGHT to protect me also. Anything done without consent in a CIVIL (NOT criminal context) is UNJUST, per the Declaration of Independence. The "obligations" in Titles 26 and 15 that are the origin of the things I "plead to" under duress are CIVIL in nature and arise out of a CIVIL franchise I never consented to participate in, and MUST consent to, to lawfully be enforceable. Even if I HAD allegiance (which I do not and withdrew years ago), this court should NOT assume that I want its CIVIL protection in the form of enforcing the duties of a franchise office/trust that I do not want, in clear violation of international human trafficking laws. As I have said numerous times in my correspondences with government, "You're FIRED forever as my civil protector". Trying to force me to consent to nominate you as such, is a violation of my biblical delegation of authority order in 1 Sam. 14:24 and 1 Sam. 8:4-20. I do not want any of these supposed "benefits" that you are offering. Therefore, the term "allegiance" in all my correspondence and interactions with any government therefore means allegiance to GOD and NEVER Caesar or any earthly government. And this is permitted and recognized per SCOTUS as follows:

*"Much has been said of the paramount duty to the state, a duty to be recognized, it is urged, even though it conflicts with convictions of duty to God. Undoubtedly that duty to the state exists within the domain of power; for government may enforce obedience to laws regardless of scruples. When one's belief collides with the power of the state, the latter is supreme within its sphere and submission, or punishment follows. But, in the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the state has always been maintained. The reservation of that supreme obligation, as a matter of principle, would unquestionably be made by many of our conscientious and law-abiding citizens. The essence of religion is belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those [283 U.S. 605, 634] arising from any human relation. As was stated by Mr. Justice Field, in *Davis v. Beason*, 133 U.S. 333, 342, 10 S.Ct. 299, 300: 'The term 'religion' has reference to one's views of his relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose of reverence for his being and character, and of obedience to his will.' One cannot speak of religious liberty, with proper appreciation of its essential and historic significance, without assuming the existence of a belief in supreme allegiance to the will of God. Professor Macintosh, when pressed by the inquiries put to him, stated what is axiomatic in religious doctrine. And, putting aside dogmas with their particular conceptions of deity, freedom of conscience itself implies respect for an innate conviction of paramount duty. The battle for religious liberty has been fought and won with respect to religious beliefs and practices, which are not in conflict with good order, upon the very ground of the supremacy of conscience within its proper field. What that field is, under our system of government, presents in part a question of constitutional law, and also, in part, one of legislative policy in avoiding unnecessary clashes with the dictates of conscience. There is abundant room for enforcing the requisite authority of law as it is enacted and requires obedience, and for maintaining the conception of the supremacy of law as essential to orderly government, without demanding that either citizens or applicants for citizenship shall assume by oath an obligation to regard allegiance to God as subordinate to allegiance to civil power. The attempt to exact such a promise, and thus to bind one's conscience by the taking of oaths or the submission to tests, has been the cause of many deplorable conflicts. The Congress has sought to avoid such conflicts in this country by respecting our happy tradition. In no sphere of legislation has the intention to prevent such clashes been more conspicuous than in relation to the bearing of arms. It would require strong evidence [283 U.S. 605, 635] that the Congress intended a reversal of its policy in prescribing the general terms of the naturalization oath. I find no such evidence.*

*[U.S. v. Macintosh, 283 U.S. 605 (1931)]*

5. I emphasize at this point that there is NO evidence on the record or docket of the court of my guilt so far, and that I am presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt WITH ADMISSIBLE evidence, and not the hearsay of mere attorneys with no personal knowledge:

A. This is a trust action. The defective indictment against the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS trust, NOT me the living man, is not admissible evidence of guilt, but mere statements by counsel that are inadmissible as evidence of guilt. Where is the sworn oath from an actual victim who claimed that I harmed them? Injury cannot be presumed. I haven't seen one. Attorneys never swear an oath to what they write. So..

B. The defective indictment is created and signed by a U.S. Attorney, and all attorneys are not "fact witnesses".

i. "This finding of a continuing investigation, which forms the foundation of the majority opinion, comes from *statements of counsel* made during the appellate process. As we have said of other un-sworn statements which were not part of the record and therefore could not have been considered by the trial court: "*Manifestly, [such statements] cannot be properly considered by us in the disposition of [a] case.*" *Adickes v. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144, 157-158, n. 16." [United States v. v. Lovasco (06/09/77) 431 U.S. 783, 97 S.Ct. 2044, 52 L.Ed. 2d 752].

- ii. “Under no possible view, however, of the findings we are considering can they be held to constitute a compliance with the statute, since they merely embody conflicting *statements of counsel* concerning the facts as they suppose them to be and their appreciation of the law which they deem applicable, there being, therefore, no attempt whatever to state the ultimate facts by a consideration of which we would be able to conclude whether or not the judgment was warranted.” Gonzales v. Buist (04/01/12) 224 U.S. 126, 56 L.Ed. 693, 32 S.Ct. 463]
- iii. “No instruction was asked, but, as we have said, the judge told the jury that they were to regard only the evidence admitted by him, not *statements of counsel*” [Holt v. United States (10/31/10) 218 U.S. 245, 54 L.Ed. 1021, 31 S.Ct. 2].
- iv. “Care has been taken, however, in summoning witnesses to testify, to call no man whose character or whose word could be successfully impeached by any methods known to the law. And it is remarkable, we submit, that in a case of this magnitude, with every means and resource at their command, the complainants, after years of effort and search in near and in the most remote paths, and in every collateral by-way, now rest the charges of conspiracy and of gullibility against these witnesses, only upon the bare *statements of counsel*. The lives of all the witnesses are clean, their characters for truth and veracity un-assailed, and the evidence of any attempt to influence the memory or the impressions of any man called, cannot be successfully pointed out in this record.” Telephone Cases, Dolbear v. American Bell Telephone Company (03/19/88) 126 U.S. 1, 31 L.Ed. 863, 8 S.Ct. 778].
- v. “Statements of counsel in brief or in argument are not sufficient for motion to dismiss or for summary judgment” [Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F.Supp. 647]
- vi. “Factual statements or documents appearing only in briefs shall not be deemed to be a part of the record in the case, unless specifically permitted by the Court” [Oklahoma Court Rules and Procedure, Federal local rule 7.1(h)]

- C. **Attorneys are impeachable as witnesses because they lack first-hand personal knowledge of the facts**, and thus their testimony is Hearsay excludable under Federal Rule of Evidence 802.
- D. Until evidence gathered from third party witnesses appears in the record of the court, the ONLY true witnesses are the accused and possibly the other “defendants”.
- E. The fact that the defective indictment is called a “true bill” does not make it admissible evidence of anything or even “true” for that matter under the Federal Rules of Evidence. I’ve seen the defective indictment, but I haven’t seen this so called “true bill”. **If you look at the last page of the defective indictment, the “true bill” section is purposefully concealed.** What is the prosecution trying to hide? N.J. Ct. R. app 3 R. R. 3.4 (a) says BAR members aren’t allowed to “unlawfully obstruct another party’s access to evidence or unlawfully alter, destroy or conceal a document or other

material having potential evidentiary value." Same with 18 U.S.C. 1519. The government did bring "charges" against the trust. Is the "true bill" a charging instrument? If so, why don't you release it to me so that I can settle this matter? I'm ready to settle with any victims that I have created. Otherwise....

## 2. NOTICE OF RESCISSION OF PLEA STATEMENT

1. **I, as the alleged/accused but NOT actual "DEFENDANT", hereby notice the Court of a reversal of the former false plea statement and the rescission of my AUTOGRAPH WHICH NULLIFIES THE PLEA STATEMENT FOR CAUSE.** How can I be a "defendant" in a void action to begin with? I could be an "accused" but without any lawful standing to bring an action then there cannot be a defendant. Period! Even though invoking the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is considered "maladministration" when dealing with due process violations, **which trump everything you can throw at me**, I'm going to quote it anyways just to prove my point that I can beat the prosecution team by using their own subordinate rules that don't even apply to me, the living man anyways. Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(5)(d)(b) provides: If a motion to withdraw a plea of guilty or nolo contendere is made before sentence is imposed, the court may permit the plea to be withdrawn if the accused/defendant shows any fair and just reason. "Motions to withdraw guilty pleas made before sentencing should be freely granted" *Government of V.I. v. Berry*, 631 F.2d 214, 219 (3d Cir. 1980) *United States v. Young*, 424 F.2d 1276, 1279 (3d Cir. 1970); *United States v. Stayton*, 408 F.2d 559, 560 (3d Cir. 1969). P.S. **This isn't a motion. I'm notifying you,** that its already happened. I don't do motions! I'm not in your society/club. However, here are some of the "fair and just" reasons which should "assert the "accused" factual and legal innocence" below:

A. The plea related to alleged crimes I not only didn't commit but couldn't commit as explained herein. **I am innocent of the charges.** Being innocent is "the accused but NOT that actual defendant's best reason for withdrawing a plea of guilty." See *United States v. Sanchez*, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22145 (D.N.J. Aug. 26, 1998). Instead, "assertions of innocence must be buttressed by facts in the record that support a claimed defense." *Ibid*. The facts are stated below in this demand. In addition to meaningfully asserting my innocence, I must also "give sufficient reasons to explain why contradictory positions were taken before the district court." *Jones*, 336 F.3d at 253. Finally, even an assertion of innocence does not by itself support a motion to withdraw a guilty plea. The assertion of innocence must have some plausibility, credibility or evidentiary support. See *United States v. Holland*, 117 F.3d 589, 594 (D.C. Cir. 1997); *Isom*, 85 F.3d at 839 (1st Cir. 1996) Keep reading.

B. The plea statement was compelled under illegal threat, duress, and coercion through kidnapping, false allegations that I was a flight risk which have consistently been proven untrue, false allegations of securities violations when no securities were even involved, (**in fact no money was even involved**) **Bitcoin is not money**... etc. In fact, it's impossible for me to even make a plea deal on behalf of a trust that I'm not a trustee or surety for to begin with! And

it's against the law to use a fictitious name like JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS under 18 U.S.C. 1342, however, I, **Joby Weeks**, the living man, was forced to do so, under duress so that I could get bail (which was denied to me several times), have the cruel and unusual punishment end, be reunited with my family and not die of Covid! An accused/defendant seeking to unravel a guilty plea must show that he pleaded guilty "under duress that [his plea] could no longer be considered a product of free will." *United States v. Bruzon-Velazquez*, 49 F.4th 23 (1st Cir. 2022). **If avoiding death isn't a good enough reason, I don't know what is!**

- C. The government's actions are in violation of the Hobbs Act. The extortion offense reaches both the obtaining of property (my rights) "under color of official right" by public officials and the obtaining of property by private actors with the victim's "consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear," including fear of economic harm. *See Criminal Resource Manual at 2405* and *Evans v. United States*, 504 U.S. 255, 265, 112 S.Ct. 1181, 1188 (1992) In this case the PROPERTY STOLEN are the CIVIL OBLIGATIONS attached to the name that I didn't expressly consent to in writing, because all consent must be in writing and must not be coerced. Wouldn't you agree that wrongfully induced consent isn't consent?
- D. The plea was therefore a deliberate lie under illegal duress, and I don't need and shouldn't need this Court's permission to STOP lying because:
  - i. It's a biblical sin to lie, but not when a gun is in your back, as in my case. Since the gun has been removed, I now have to stop lying, or face my Maker. When a crime is committed under duress, then the guilty party is the SOURCE of duress, which in this case is the government and not me. **If a robber holds a gun in your back and forces you to rob a bank, who robbed the bank? You or the man with the gun?**
  - ii. They say that the plea agreement is a "contract". (Yet it's NOT binding on the government... So, is it really a contract?) If you believe it is a legit contract then remember that no contract which effects a crime is enforceable in any court of law. That crime is perjury and fraud, and the guilty party is the SOURCE of the duress, WHICH IS THE PLAINTIFF, not the perpetrator compelled at gun point as explained in this section. This is a **rescission** of the plea and my autograph on the application. Since I have a right to contract, I have a right to un-contract too.
  - iii. A judge has NO discretion to choose to violate the law or to protect violations of law by others. That would make her an anarchist and a criminal who is protecting other criminals. If she does so, she vacates her office, avails herself, and is operating in a private capacity and subject to a constitutional tort. She must reverse the plea.
  - iv. For me to even acknowledge judicial discretion to perpetuate or protect or refuse to end such crimes (by omission) would make me a co-conspirator with her in the commission, protection of, or continuation of such crimes. And I don't want to break the law! Forcing me to break the law is not right!

v. Even the Magna Carta (which pre-dates the constitution by hundreds of years) says that “*No free man shall be seized, imprisoned, dispossessed, outlawed, exiled or ruined in any way, nor in any way proceeded against, except by the lawful judgement of his peers and the law of the land. To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay right or justice.*” The constitution is the law of the land and it says that **what the prosecution has been doing is illegal!** Was I convicted of a crime by my peers? No. Was I denied a trial? Yes. Was I denied bail? Yes! Was I thrown in jail for 11 months without being convicted of a crime by my peers? Yes! That is a crime! I am a victim. You must dismiss! I gave no consent to be kidnapped and tortured and I contested every continuance. It’s simple, if you aren’t going to give me a trial than give me bail. If you aren’t going to give me bail, then give me a trial. **I was denied both.** And then I was tortured for months until I finally falsely “admitted” that  $2+2=5$ .

vi. Remember, taking an oath of office to follow the constitution is a contract. If the government is allowed to nullify my right to bail and a trial, violating their oath/contract, than I have every right to nullify and rescission the plea deal “contract” too. I dont want your 5k letter. I want case dismissed!

vii. A judge, whose job is to prevent and punish violations of law, would be promoting such violations to interfere with or negate a knowingly fraudulent guilty plea. Once this court has been notified of the crime, to protect it establishes judicial “mens rea” as a co-conspirator, and which, is also an “Accessory After the Fact” in violation of 18 U.S.C. §3, “Misprision of Felony” in violation of 18 U.S.C. §4 and “Willful Blindness” 18 U.S.C. §1028.

DOES THIS COURT CLAIM THE AUTHORITY TO COMMIT THE CRIMES OF PERJURY AND FRAUD BY OMISSION BY NOT WITHDRAWING MY PLEA AS A PARTY WHO WAS COMPELLED TO COMMIT THESE CRIMES BY THE GOVERNMENT? That would be a “crime against justice” itself if so. I hope the judge understands the consequences of not recognizing the rescission of this bogus plea agreement and dismisses me from this case swiftly. Shall I go on?

E. Under the Fruit of a Poisonous Tree Doctrine in *Silverthorne Lumber Co. v. United States*, 251 U.S. 385 (1920), evidence gathered illegally by the commission of a crime, including torture and duress, is inadmissible. Thus, the plea and proffers as evidence are not admissible. We all know evidence obtained while torturing someone for months isn’t reliable anyways. Shouldn’t the prosecutors just follow the law and convict someone of a crime BEFORE throwing innocent people in jail and torturing them, so they can get a legit conviction? Wouldn’t it make them feel better about themselves if they followed the law and got the conviction fair and square? If we were playing Monopoly and I was the banker, and you caught me stealing money from the bank so I could beat you... would you consider that a legitimate win? Of course not. You would you say, “You cheated. It’s not a clean win. Doesn’t count.” That’s what I’m saying. The prosecution team are obviously a bunch of cheaters who don’t follow the law/constitution. And the judge allowed them to do it. Their “win”, (torturing me until I lied and plead guilty to a “crime” I didn’t commit and wasn’t

even indicted for) isn't legit. No one respects a bunch of thugs and cheaters. You persecutors should have followed the law and tried to get the win fair and square. Shame on you.

- F. My lawyers at Carlton Fields who submitted the plea, defrauded me, as mentioned in my last notice. Thats why I had to fire them! Fraud vitiates all contracts. See: "cause of fraud and swindle" 18 U.S.C. 1341.
- G. My lazy lawyers at Carlton Fields wanted easy money so they wouldn't have to do any real work like going to trial and giving me real justice as a true innocent. They didn't sign up to defend my interests but to act as "plea bargaining specialists" to avoid the REAL work of a trial. Thus I have been forced to do the work that I paid them an exorbitant amount of money to do myself!
- H. The two alleged "crimes" that I didn't commit but plead guilty to under duress in 26 U.S.C. §7201 and 18 U.S.C. §371 involve civil statutory obligations that did not apply to me as a nonresident not in possession or control of government property or privileges at the time of the alleged but not actual offense. As such, the office of statutory "person" (in the case of 26 U.S.C. §7343 and 26 U.S.C. §7201) and "person" (in the case of 15 U.S.C. §77b(a)(2) and 15 U.S.C. §77x) that the civil statutory obligations attach to is vacant, and was never lawfully or consensually occupied to begin with. To PRESUME that these statuses can operate extraterritorially outside the statutory geographical "United States" without the consent of the party subject to them or to the office they attach to is **criminal identity theft** in violation of 18 U.S.C. §912, **slavery** (Thirteenth Amendment and 18 U.S.C. §1583), and **human trafficking** (18 U.S.C. §1590). The abuse of this "lawfare" by the Prosecution to enforce such involuntary obligations upon me also constitutes a violation of 18 U.S.C. §1589(a)(3) which the Court is complicit in if it permits these to continue by keeping me on this case. Is this court out of honor? Therefore, all civil statutory obligations attached to the two vacant CIVIL statutory offices (trusts/franchises) are the responsibility of the Creator/Trustee and owner of the civil office of "person" which is the government and not me the living man. Im the beneficiary. You are the trustee! Government cannot be the owner of anything without accepting BOTH the RIGHTS AND the corresponding RESPONSIBILITIES/LIABILITIES attached to that office/privilege/res of civil statutory "person". OWNERSHIP and RESPONSIBILITY always go together and can never be separated, no matter how much the government might corruptly want to evade responsibility for its property, and the damage it's doing to me the living man right now, through the abuse of it by the Prosecutors. More about civil statutory statuses as offices within the government grantor is found at:

*Proof That There Is a "Straw Man"*, Form #05.042; <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StrawMan.pdf>. Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

- I. The alleged offenses were committed abroad and relate to activities of myself as a civil nonresident not in receipt of a public benefit or civil status.

- i. In the case of the falsely plead tax “crime”, I was living abroad at the time of the alleged offense and situated as a nonresident alien and NOT a civil statutory citizen mentioned in 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c) and 26 U.S.C. 3121(e). Consistent with this status, the tax returns I filed for the affected years were 1040NR returns with no tax owing other than a generous donation. Only when an American National abroad claims STATUTORY citizen status can they receive the benefit of civil statutory protection or have an obligation to pay an income tax for the protection of the U.S. government from non-U.S. sourced income. This is evidenced by the case of Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 (1924), in which the plaintiff was domiciled or situated in Mexico. I too had a home in Mexico during the alleged but not actual commission of the so called tax offense. However, Cook claimed the “privileged civil statutory citizen status” by filing a 1040 instead of a 1040NR and thereby had to pay income tax on WORLDWIDE EARNINGS rather than only U.S. Sourced earnings. The Supreme court, specifically ex-President Taft, at time acting as Chief Justice, declared that Cook DID owe a tax on non-U.S. (26 U.S.C. §7701(a) (9) and (a)(10) AND U.S. government as a corporation) sourced payments and justified the tax by saying he was in receipt of a privilege and a benefit of tax deductions applicable to those who are privileged “U.S. persons” who file a 1040:

*“The contention was rejected that a citizen's property without the limits of the United States derives no benefit from the United States. The contention, it was said, came from the confusion of thought in "mistaking the scope and extent of the sovereign power of the United States as a nation and its relations to its citizens and their relations to it." And that power in its scope and extent, it was decided, is based on the presumption that government by its very nature benefits the citizen and his property wherever found, and that opposition to it holds on to citizenship while it "belittles and destroys its advantages and blessings by denying the possession by government of an essential power required to make citizenship completely beneficial." In other words, the principle was declared that the government, by its very nature, benefits the citizen and his property wherever found and, therefore, has the power to make the benefit complete. Or to express it another way, the basis of the power to tax was not and cannot be made dependent upon the situs of the property in all cases, it being in or out of the United States, and was not and cannot be made dependent upon the domicile of the citizen, that being in or out of the United States, but upon his relation as citizen to the United States and the relation of the latter to him as citizen. The consequence of the relations is that the native citizen who is taxed may have domicile, and the property from which his income is derived may have situs, in a foreign country and the tax be legal — the government having power to impose the tax.*

*[Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 (1924)]*

Note that per the above, I do not and DID NOT, when I filed the 1040NR returns for the affected years, claim the BENEFITS associated with the PRIVILEGED civil status of STATUTORY “citizen” per 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c) or 26 U.S.C. 3121(e). It is furthermore my RIGHT to not claim the benefits, privileges, or protections of such civil statutory status or the corresponding obligation to pay for them. To suggest otherwise is to promote international slavery and human trafficking by THIS COURT.

ii. No one can be compelled to accept a “benefit” or the civil obligation to pay for it, as the court is trying to do here.

That “benefit” INCLUDES civil statutory protection of those abroad. Here are some **Maxims** I found to prove my point:

*“Invito beneficium non datur. No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 69. But if he does not dissent, he will be considered as assenting. Vide Assent.*

*Potest quis renunciare pro se, et suis, juri quod pro se introductum est. A man may relinquish, for himself and his heirs, a right which was introduced for his own benefit. See 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83.*

*Quilibet potest renunciare juri pro se inducto. Anyone may renounce a law introduced for his own benefit. To this rule there are some exceptions. See 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83.”*

*[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856]*

J. When I entered the fraudulent plea under duress, my wife was almost at the end of her child rearing age, and we wanted more children. If we couldn't, then **genocide would be the result for our gene pool** because we might not have anyone to turn our estate over to if my daughter Liberty dies. It's impossible to have more children when I am locked in a cage for up to 72 hours at a time... Does genocide and the threat of death explain why I had to lie and “admit” 2+2=5?

K. It's now clear to me, based on the thousands of hours I spent doing legal research behind bars for 11 months, the magnitude of the evil and the proof of its existence that gave rise to the government's decision to prosecute this “frivolous” proceeding. If this proceeding is NOT frivolous, please explain why its taken the government 5 years to find evidence to put together a trial and get a legit conviction? Shouldn't they have had some evidence of a crime before they kidnapped me? The references I have cited in this pleading are a mere sampling of some of the extensive research into government corruption conducted during my unjust imprisonment and subsequent house arrest that has been going on for years and years! The “Fed Zone” U.S.A. Inc. (controlled by the private Federal Reserve banking cartel) apparently wants to use this unjust prosecution to protect an unconstitutional money printing and money laundering monopoly because it doesn't like the competition of a free market technology, like Bitcoin, without regulation or controls within a Private Membership Association (PMA) like Bitclub. Remember, Bitcoin is not “Money”. The FED's unconstitutional money monopoly is exhaustively described in:

*The Money Scam*, Form #05.041, <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/MoneyScam.pdf> Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

I would be complicit in the government's RICO money laundering monopoly to condone or protect it by pleading guilty to crimes that I not only didn't commit, but which I was literally held unjust hostage at gunpoint until I admitted to committing. Kidnapping is a crime. The love of fiat paper currency that isn't even Constitutional/lawful money, seems to be behind all of the persecution I have suffered in this case so far. 1 Tim. 6:10. “For the love of money is the root of all evil!” When will this hypocrisy and injustice end so I can be merely left alone to live my life responsibly, in

peace as justice itself demands? Judges are called “justices” because they are supposed to protect my unalienable right to be left alone by the government. A government I have asked for NOTHING from EXCEPT to be left alone to own my life and support myself without help?

*“The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.”*

*[Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990)]*

*“Do not strive with [or try to regulate or control or enslave] a man without cause, if he has done you no harm.”*

*[Prov. 3:30, Bible, NKJV]*

*“Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been, and ever will be pursued, until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit.”*

*[The Federalist No. 51 (1788), James Madison]*

2. Notice is given that I am NOT withdrawing the plea for any of the following, clearly malicious reasons:

- A. To avoid or evade responsibility for any aspect of my behavior or choices. This “pleading” in fact emphasizes that I am willing to settle the payment of any and all damages to specific parties that are proven to be traced to my choices and/or behavior without the need for a trial. Refusing to volunteer for a civil office and lawfully avoiding the obligations of the office, however, is the exercise of a RIGHT of self-ownership over myself, not an evasion of responsibility. Ownership of myself implies the right to exclude all others, including governments, from the use or benefit of my body, my time, or my services without compensation that I and not THEY determine. To argue against the exercise of this right of self-ownership is to promote slavery and human trafficking on an international scale and make this court a conspirator in its execution in violation of 18 U.S.C. §371. *“Every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor; is generally admitted; and no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits, and appropriate them against his will...” The Antelope, 23 U.S. 66, 10 Wheat 66, 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825).* My body is a gift from Yah, our creator. I gave my life and body back to him when I became a Christian. I no longer own this body. **I stand in Yah, our creator’s Kingdom** and I am the trustee of this physical body. You cannot cross over! Therefore the “plea statement” is rescissioned because Yah doesn’t allow me to pimp this body out, as surely, to anyone else, and certainly not in exchange for a privilege that ultimately only benefits the government and its officers and never me the living man.
- B. To needlessly make the government prejudiced and cause more work for this Court or the Prosecution.
- C. To needlessly run up expenses for either side. I’ve already had hundreds of Bitcoin stolen from me over this matter.

D. To needlessly argue that I am a so called “sovereign citizen”, which is clearly an **oxymoron** as exhaustively shown in the following: *Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty*, Form #08.018;  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/RebFalseArgSovereignty.pdf>. Silence is agreement.

Read and rebut if you disagree.

3. The alleged but not actual “DEFENDANT” demands one of the following two JUST actions by this court:
  - A. That the defective indictment against the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS trust be bifurcated from the other accused defendants and tried SEPARATELY and that I am given a trial by jury of my “nonresident alien like peers” in an article 3 court. Or...
  - B. That I settle with all demonstrably injured parties without the need for trial, of which I believe there are none, and then to have the judge just dismiss the trust from this fictitious but not actual conspiracy all together so that I and the people I provably injured can get on with our lives. That would require the least amount of work, money, and time for all involved. If the prosecutors feel the need to go after the founders and owners of Bitclub, the people who actually made the decisions and had control of the Bitcoin and website, so be it. But leave me out of it since no decision-making authority within Bitclub on my part has been connected to me with evidence. Five people were “indicted” in this conspiracy. Four of them were there from day one. Matt and Russ were the creators/owners of Bitclub, Cailen is the computer programmer who ran the website and Joe Able was the master distributor. I didn’t join Bitclub as a member until 16 months AFTER Bitclub was up and running. The government, through this “frivolous” proceeding, left over a million other Bitclub members, like me, out of the prosecution’s conspiracy theory. Those members were doing exactly what I was doing at the time of the defective indictment. **Why was I the only member arrested?** Selective and vindictive enforcement is unjust and discriminatory. Fed Rule of Criminal Procedure 12 (b) goes over several of these issues that this case violates including the selective enforcement one mentioned above. I’m sure this motion and the rescission of my plea will cause a realistic likelihood of vindictive retaliation against me for speaking the truth. Think about the predicament I’m in. If I lie and say  $2+2=5$  then I don’t die, I get bail, a 5k co-operation agreement letter, my property is returned and a “time served” sentence. If I tell the truth and stand on my rights then I get no bail, no speedy trial, no co-operation letter, ill probably get killed and I’m looking at 20 years if I take it to trial... **What would you do?** If you were in my situation and your lawyers came to you and said; “What would you prefer? Spend one year being unlawfully imprisoned without due process (they didn’t mention the 4 years on house arrest I’d be doing on the back end) take a plea deal (LIE) so you could get bail and not die of COVID but then be “guilty” of a victimless “crime” you didn’t commit? ... Or would you prefer spending five years in jail, being unlawfully imprisoned, possibly die of COVID, waiting around until they finally get around to giving you a rigged

trial where you may or may not be found innocent. And if you fail at trial, and COVID doesn't kill you, you're looking at 20 years."

I always thought being innocent and telling the truth was the way to go through life, however, in this scenario, it sure seemed like the best move for me would be to lie and say  $2+2=5$ . **This is wrong and you all know it.** However, everyone I have asked that question to says that I should, "*Just ADMIT that  $2+2=5$  because the government cheats and plays dirty. It's better to be free and alive as a felon, spending time with your family, than in a dangerous jail as an innocent who got railroaded by an unjust system run by criminals*". The temptation to capitulate was extreme. (1 Corinthians 10:13) says, "*God is faithful, and he will not let you be tempted beyond your ability, but with the temptation he will also provide the way of escape, that you may be able to endure it.*" I'm embarrassed that I let the fear of death make me tell a lie so I could be released even though I knew I was innocent. I believe that the truth shall set me free which is why I have rescissioned my plea statement.

Yah, our creator, commands me in Eph. 5:11 to "*Have nothing to do with the fruitless deeds of darkness, but rather expose them*". I feel like if I don't expose what I know to be massive corruption in this case, then I would be guilty of a misprision of felony myself. **That's why I approached the government BEFORE the defective indictment with what I thought were clean hands and still are clean hands.** I wanted to work with them to catch bad guys (hackers) who harm others. Now I'm thoroughly convinced with irrefutable evidence that after 11 months of being in jail and another 4 years on house arrest, studying the law, that the government prosecutors are the actual criminals, as you will discover in the Conclusion section. Just look what they tried to do to President Trump! I'm sure he would agree with me!

4. One good example of malicious intent in this case on the part of the government centered on passports. Once I was tortured long enough to "admit" that  $2+2=5$  (i.e., the plea deal) and I was finally given bail, (home incarceration) The government sent me back my passport they stole from me without me ever asking for it, even though it was confiscated because I was a supposed flight risk! Did they suddenly change their mind and conclude that I was no longer a flight risk? Were they trying to entice me to violate bail and flee with the passport so they could send me back to jail thus increasing the odds of winning their case by interfering with my ability to litigate because I was in jail? **The government has tried to get my bail revoked 4 separate times since being released even though I broke no laws and harmed no people!** The evidence is overwhelming that they are vindictive and have contempt for me and by extension, **contempt for the truth and our constitution.** They clearly want nothing more than to have me back in jail or dead. This is because they are a RICO protection racket funded with illegally collected asset forfeiture and income tax dollars that only goes protects themselves most of the time, even though the reason they were established was to protect "we the people" (me), right?

They forget that “we the people” are the source of their power! They have smugly forgotten their place and who their bosses (we the people) truly are.

5. My probation officer was shocked that they sent me my passport back when I called him up. He told me that I needed to come down to his office so he could confiscate the passport again for a 2<sup>nd</sup> time! Wouldn’t someone who is a flight risk, keep the passport and not tell his probation officer? Was that a test? This is evidence that I was obviously NOT a flight risk and that the persecutors are liars for saying the opposite! Yet, I still have an ankle bracelet on 4 years later? Why am I not allowed to go to weddings and funerals of my friends and family members? Why wont they let me go to the gym or church or have a job to support my family or use a phone or computer or have a bank account or use Bitcoin etc. etc.?
6. My family put up a \$2m bond so I could be released. (Again, I wonder how much money the court has made trading that bond over the years... Is the court paying taxes on that “income”?) I would never flee and make my parents homeless. They are in their 70’s. They literally staked EVERYTHING they have ever acquired over their ENTIRE lives on me and my word because they know I’m innocent! Innocent people who cooperate with the prosecutors don’t flee! Saying I was a flight risk was a lie. So why did the judge take the side of liars and violate my right to due process (bail and a trial) and allow the government to torture me for 11 months until I had had enough, instead of following the law and giving me bail?
7. Look, I want my day in a court of proper venue. I want to tell the jury of my non resident peers what has been done to me and my family and I don’t want to wait years and years for it! Or, better yet, I’d like to take responsibility for any victims I’ve demonstrably harmed and settle this case immediately without the need for trial. I am not aware of anyone I have ever harmed in the context of Bitclub. I was not an officer or decision maker in Bitclub. If the government believes otherwise, they have the burden of proving it as the moving party falsely alleging a crime. It has been more than 5 years since I was arrested... Am I supposed to sit here on house arrest for a decade or what? My parents too? They have been on house arrest with me for over 1500 days (48 months!) as my “3rd party custodians”! They did nothing wrong yet they have been punished for this non sense too! Enough!
8. It’s a total travesty of justice that brings a huge stain upon the body politic and the body corporate that I even must explain such fundamental legal concepts to learned legal minds **who should know better** but who feign ignorance to avoid personal responsibility for their massive misdeeds and fraud on an unprecedented scale. But I’m sure I could have made the jury understand, despite the prosecution’s extreme efforts to PRETEND that they DON’T know about commercial/trust law, in order to evade responsibility of fraudulently creating “constructive trusts” and then trying to trick me into acting as a pseudo trustee/public officer. If I emulated what the prosecutors have been doing, this court would throw the book at me!! This court is NOT in honor. Mark 13:11. The main thing, by the way, that Satan was trying to accomplish in his rebellion was to avoid responsibility to Yah, our creator, and His laws, as the Prosecution are doing now by continuing their charade to ignore such fundamental issues. Does the Prosecution work for Satan or Yah, our creator? “*No man can*

*serve two masters* ". Psalm 2:12. The Prosecution wants me to take responsibility for the duties of a fictitious civil office ("person") aka the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS trust that I don't consent to, receive no pay and benefits for, and can't even lawfully occupy extraterritorially without violating 4 U.S.C. §72 and 18 U.S.C. §912.<sup>1</sup> And yet, the prosecution won't even take responsibility for the CONSTITUTIONAL duties of the office they volunteered for and pretend like those duties don't even exist while collecting a full paycheck and retiring on duty to boot! Hypocrites is what Yahshua (Jesus) called them in the book written by a former tax collector when speaking about lawyers, Matt. 23.

I repeat, the fraudulently induced "Plea statement regarding Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks" # 19-cr-877 (CCC)-03, Dated 09/24/2020, that was used to maliciously, unlawfully and illegally embondage, torture and de-wealth rescissioner for years has been rescissioned. PLEASE TAKE NOTICE: i, Jobadiah-Sinclair: Weeks, a sentient moral man, Settler of JSW Trust, Secure Party Creditor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (Beneficiary/accused) **Rescission** the Autograph as it appears on the "Plea statement" It was never "signed". It was intended for a person of which I am not. That induced statement was used to maliciously, unlawfully and illegally embondage, torture and de-wealth rescissioner, a third party victim, for years. This Rescission shall include every Autograph on every document, copy, bearing the **autograph**, "Jobadiah Weeks", for cause.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE: i, Jobadiah-Sinclair: Weeks, a sentient moral man, **Rescission** the autograph on ANY and ALL document(s) obtained, held, kept, filed, used, sent, received, archived, copied, duplicated, submitted or whatall. Rescissioner willingly, knowingly, voluntarily, intentionally and intelligently performed this act and deed. Rescissioner made a mistake by autographing "Jobadiah Weeks" in the stead of a person listed on the document by the name of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS who he was/is not. The name on the document was similar and rescissioner inadvertently autographed in the place of that person. The "Plea statement regarding Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks" was fraudulently induced and was intended to perpetrate a fraud and IS **Fraud** and therefore VOID. Rescissioner received NO value or consideration from "Plea statement regarding JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS" and therefore **no contract could be valid**.

Therefore, i now repent of my sin.

"My son, if you: Have you become guarantor for your friend, Have shaken hands in a pledge for a stranger, Have been snared by the words of your own mouth, Have been caught by the words of your own mouth - Do this at once, my son, and deliver yourself, For you have come into the hand of your friend: Go, humble yourself, and urge your friend. Give no sleep to your eyes, Nor slumber to your eyelids. Deliver yourself like a gazelle from the hunter's hand, And like a bird from the hand of the trapper."

---

<sup>1</sup> See: [Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf), Form #05.052; <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf>

"He who is guarantor for a stranger suffers harm, But one who hates shaking hands in a pledge is safe." Law and Equity provide for rescission for mistake of the fact or actual or constructive fraud, and voidance where the fraud is the determining motive of the contract to wit in pertinent part:

"Rescission".... A party's unilateral unmaking of a contract for a legally sufficient reason.. Rescission is generally available as a remedy or defense for a non-defaulting party and restores the parties to their pre-contractual positions.. [Black's Law Dictionary, ed., s.v. "Rescission"] (U/L emphasis added)

"Rescission" an act of rescinding, annulling, or vacating or of canceling or abrogating (as by restoring to another party to a contract or transaction that one has received from him). [Merriam-Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, inc. version 2.5., s.v. "Rescission"]

"Rescission". The equity for the rescission and cancellation of agreements, deeds and other instruments arise when a transaction is vitiated by illegality or fraud, or by reason of it's having been carried on in ignorance or mistake of facts material to its operation. The Jurisdiction of equity is exercised upon the principle the *quia timet*; that is, for fear that such agreements, securities, deeds and other instruments may be voraciously or injuriously used against the party seeking relief, when the evidence to impeach them may be lost; or that they may throw a cloud or suspicion over his interest or title; or where he has a defense good and equity which cannot be made available at law. The cases in which this relief will be granted on account of the misrepresentation and fraud may be divided into four classes: *first*, where there is actual fraud in the party in which the party plaintiff has not participated; Smith v. Richards, 13 pet. (U.S. 26, 10 L. Ed. 42); *secondly*, where there is constructive fraud against public policy and the party plaintiff does not appear to have participated therein; *thirdly*, where there is a fraud against public policy and the party plaintiff has participated therein, but public policy would be defeated by allowing it to stand; *fourthly*, where there is a constructive fraud by both parties, - that is, were both parties are *in delicto*, but not *in para delicto*; see 2 Story, Eq. Jur. § 694... [Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 3rd rev., 8th cd., s.v. "Rescission"]

FRAUD.. *Actual* or positive *fraud* includes cases of the intentional and successful employment of any cunning, deception, or artifice, used to circumvent, cheat, or deceive another.. 1 Story Eq. Jur. § 186.

### 3. Exhibit 1: PETITION TO DISMISS PETITIONER FROM CASE

1. Your Honor, I demand that you dismiss this case against the government's property, the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (trust). I, Joby Weeks, the living man, above the age of majority, without the disability of minority, not civilly dead or lost at sea, was falsely arrested in 2019. It's 2025 now... I'm not OK with sitting here on house arrest for years and years and years because of crimes I didn't commit, and as the beneficiary of the trust, had no influence or authority to commit. I have many things I have yet to accomplish here on earth before returning home to heaven. I've already missed marriages and funerals of important family members and friends. While my baby daughter Liberty was learning how to walk and talk, I was unjustly held captive with a bunch of dangerous and violent people. Even though I harmed no one. (My first cell mate

had been in jail for 17 years for murder!) Enough! It's time to free me from this constructive fraud being perpetrated against me the living man.

2. Here are some of the reasons why the government should dismiss this case against ITSELF, as the owner of the vacant civil statutory office/trust attached to the franchise mark described in 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d).
  - A. Because, in reality, the government is the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (trust) fiduciary and therefore the responsible party, not me the man and illegally and criminally compelled surety for their office of "person".
  - B. This litigation is happening "In REM" against "The Res" that I have been made compelled surety for and NOT against me the living man. This is an outgrowth of *Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 U.S. 714 (1878) whereby the U.S. Supreme Court held that foreign entities not operating within exclusive jurisdiction of a state are only reachable through property PHYSICALLY within that state. The "res" is property. This is NOT an Article III court in the Judicial Branch, but an Article IV court in the Executive Branch for the purpose of this proceeding, its administrative IS IT NOT??? It's commercial. It's part of the U.C.C. Yet you have sworn to uphold the common law! If you think about it, these so-called courts operate more like banks with Corporate Arbitration Boards Consisting of an Arbitrator ("acting" "Judge") and sometimes a panel of corporate employees (so-called "Juries"). The "jury trial" i.e. Panel decisions (recommendation) can be reversed by the Arbitrator. In real Article III courts we have a "trial by a jury of our peers" and judges can't overrule their verdicts. This franchise "court" is issuing bonds against the trust and also this case! I have the CUSIP numbers to prove it! It's all about the money these pirates want to raid from the Cestui que trust. Again, the Plaintiff is litigating against property, (The Res/Cardholder/Trust) NOT me the living man. Thus, I should be freed, and this case dismissed. "*A judgment (or a plea deal) rendered in violation of due process is void in the rendering state and is not entitled to full faith and credit else where*" [*Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 U.S. 714 (1878)]
3. I do NOT claim that I am exempt or excluded from Title 15 and Title 26 because of my civil status, whether citizen, resident, nonresident alien, individual, taxpayer, person, etc. Instead, I claim that any civil status mentioned in these Codes to which civil statutory obligations DIRECTLY attach must be VOLUNTARY and avoidable, because the Thirteenth Amendment outlaws involuntary servitude everywhere in the COUNTRY, not just within states of the Union. International laws also outlaw human trafficking and slavery everywhere in the WORLD. The only civil status in your code to which civil statutory obligations do NOT DIRECTLY attach is that of "nonresident alien", and as a free man who does not consent to be a slave or a peon (paying off endless mountains of public debt) or a victim of human trafficking, that is the only civil status I can reasonably consent to without violating my duties as Yah, our creator's, Trustee. 1 Cor. 7:23. It would be fraud for me to claim otherwise. To put it another way, I don't work for you! I work for God! To the prosecutors, please slowly read that last paragraph again so it sinks in. See the following for exhaustive proof that civil statutory obligations (and taxation that implements them) are voluntary and avoidable:

Lawfully Avoiding Government Obligations Course, Form #12.040; <https://sedm.org/LibertyU/AvoidGovernmentObligations.pdf>. Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

*The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to "taxpayers" [officers, employees and elected officials of the federal Gov.] and not to "non-taxpayers" [American citizens and nationals not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal Gov.] the latter are without scope. No procedure is prescribed for non-taxpayers and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them (non-taxpayers) Congress does not assume to deal and are neither of the subject or object of revenue laws.*

*[Economy Plumbing & Heating v. United States, 470 F.2D. 585 (1972) and Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 (1922)]*

The courts have already ruled that private living people are NOT "taxpayers"!!

*...Every taxpayer is a Cestui que trust having sufficient interest in preventing abuse of the trust to be recognized in the field of this court's prerogative jurisdiction as a relator in the proceedings to set sovereign authority in motion by actions..." [In re Bolens 135 N.W. Rep. 164 (1912)]*

Again, I am a living man. I am NOT a trust! I should be freed, and this case dismissed! Shall I go on?

### **3.1. There is no standing to join me to the conspiracy.**

1. The doctrine of standing enunciated in Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 112 S.Ct. 2130, 119 L.Ed.2d. 351 (1992), the U.S. Supreme Court described three criteria for standing to sue:
  - A. First, the plaintiff must have suffered an "injury in fact"—an invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized and (b) "actual or imminent, not 'conjectural' or 'hypothetical.'"
  - B. Second, there must be a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of—the injury must be "fairly . . . trace[able] to the challenged action of the accused, and not . . . th[e] result [of] the independent action of some third party not before the court."
  - C. Third, it must be "likely," as opposed to merely "speculative," that the injury will be "redressed by a favorable decision."
2. I assert that government had no standing to join me to this action because the criteria for standing was not satisfied in the case of me, the Petitioner:
  - A. No specific injured party has been named who I have harmed. Thus, the injury cannot be "particularized" to a specific flesh and blood protected man or woman. If they miraculously come up with a living "victim" I can guarantee that I wasn't the cause. Think about it. There were over 1,000,000 members from 100 different countries that were in the club. Bitclub was paying all the members in the PMA up until the day we were kidnapped. The government confiscated thousands of Bitcoin from the members and thousands of bitcoins more worth of their physical bitcoin

mining hardware equipment, which at the time was generating around 92 Bitcoins a day! If there are any victims, the government was the one who created them! The members have lost 165,000 Bitcoins over the last 1800 days because of government intervention! **That is quite the loss the GOVERNMENT is responsible for.** Shouldn't the government return to the victims the Bitcoin they stole from the victims? That way there would be no victims! In this case, the government has been doing the opposite of what "We the People" hired them to do. I.e. Protect the public... NOT steal from them and then blame the theft on me who had nothing to do with it!

- B. Petitioner was NOT an officer or decision maker who had any control over Bitclub's Know Your Customer Policies that caused the alleged damages by locking people, who did not go through the Know Your Customer (KYC) process, out of their accounts until they completed it. KYC is a policy that the government wants companies to do with their customers, even though a Private Membership Associations (PMA) such as Bitclub have no obligation to do so.
  - i. Following the KYC line of thought: The money laundering statutes behind the KYC rules are a SCAM that presuppose those subjected to them are voluntary public officers within the national government, which I, a member of Bitclub and Bitclub itself (a Private Membership Association) are NOT! See:
  - ii. [Money Laundering Enforcement SCAM](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/MoneyLaunderingScam.pdf), Form #05.044; <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/MoneyLaunderingScam.pdf> Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.
  - iii. [Why It is Illegal for You to Enforce Money Laundering Statute in my Specific Case](https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/MonLaundEnfIllegal.pdf), Form #06.046; <https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/MonLaundEnfIllegal.pdf>. Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.
- C. No evidence has been presented that demonstrates causal connection between any act or omission of the Petitioner that directly caused any of the alleged damages to the Bitclub members. I being one of the members. Why would I defraud myself and my own family? Hello!?
- D. Independent actions or inactions by the other "accused" in the action relating to the KYC rules may have been the causes of the supposed injuries. In fact, **I, as a member, was locked out of my own Bitclub account for several months** until I completed the KYC process that Bitclub chose to implement. **I used my Mexican ID and Mexican mailing address, so as to stay compliant with the Bitclub membership agreement, which banned 8 U.S.C. §1401 and 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c) STATUTORY "US CITIZENS" (fictions of law) from joining.** If I, the living man, owed any taxes from mining Bitcoin (**which isn't money**) I'd owe it to the place that I consented to a domicile and asked for protection, which is NOT the "Fed Zone" United States Inc. And for the record, there is no such place on earth because Yah, our creator, commands us to be foreigners and therefore nonresidents to the world. I would also not owe it to the United States government either, since I did not have a domicile in the United States at the time. There was no

taxable event. I was and still am a nonresident alien and have renounced all protection of the corrupt U.S. government. In fact, the current U.S. foreign policy makes Americans less safe according to the CIA anyways. Trust me, I know, having traveled to more than 175 countries thus far. Do you think the DemonicRats importing 13,000 convicted murderers and another 15,000 convicted sex offenders into the country in the last 4 years is making Americans safer?

E. I believe my love of traveling the world and the governments love of violating our constitutional rights was the reason why I was denied bail. The prosecutors claimed I was a “flight risk” because they said I had “spent the last 20 years as a perpetual traveler, never staying anywhere long enough to satisfy the “residency requirements” of any jurisdiction... look at all these flights he took your honor!” The prosecution is correct, the Petitioner is “**stateless**” because I was not domiciled in the “United States” at the time of the offense and **therefore I must be dismissed from this case.**

*“In order to be a citizen of a State within the meaning of the diversity statute, a natural person must both be a citizen of the United States and be domiciled within the State. See Robertson v. Cease, 97 U.S. 646, 648-649 (1878); Brown v. Keene, 8 Pet. 112, 115 (1834). The problem in this case is that Bettison, although a United States citizen, has no domicile in any State. He is therefore “**stateless**” for purposes of § 1332(a)(3). Subsection 1332(a)(2), which confers jurisdiction in the District Court when a citizen of a State sues aliens only, also could not be satisfied because Bettison is a United States citizen.”*

*[Newman-Green v. Alfonxo Larrain, 490 U.S. 826 (1989)]*

If it still hasn’t sunk in yet... This case is styled as a quasi-criminal and not a criminal case because it has a predicate civil status of “person” for the purposes of 15 U.S.C. §77b(a)(2) in the case of the 18 U.S.C. §371 count and 26 U.S.C. §7343 in the case of the 26 U.S.C. §7201 count. The fact that it has a predicate civil status is the reason, in fact, why it is quasi-criminal instead of purely criminal. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17 (b) requires a domicile within the exclusive jurisdiction of the national government in the statutory geographical “United States” per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a) (9) and (a)(10) to be suable CIVILLY or to have a civil status that is suable for a failure to perform the CIVIL duty of securities registration or for the payment/filing of income forms. Yet, in the next breath, after the prosecutors just said I wasn’t a resident anywhere, they say that I owe them “taxes.” The prosecutors KNOW that a person’s “domicile” determines who they pay taxes to. It’s right there in black and white. The Supreme Court admitted it in Miller Brother Co. vs Maryland 347 U.S. 340 (1954). ***Domicile and NOT nationality is what imputes a status under the I.R.C. and a liability for a tax. Tax liability is a civil liability that attaches to civil statutory law, which in turn attaches to the “person” through their choice of domicile.*** The prosecutors “conspiracy theory” action is the equivalent of a class action like Newman-Green above, in which **Bettison had to be dismissed** from the class (as do I) because he did not have a domicile within the statutory geographical “United States”. **The prosecutors already agreed with this fact on the record** and used it to deny me bail. Unfortunately for them, “They can’t have their cake and eat it too”. Meaning, they can’t deny me bail because I don’t have a domicile/residency in the United States and then say, I am liable for a tax, that only applies to residents, when they just said I wasn’t one! It’s already on the record!

The “thing” (the res) that needs the domicile is the OFFICE of “person” and not the OFFICER consensually FILLING said office. The civil office/franchise/trust of “person” in this case does have a domicile in the statutory geographical “United States” because it is created and owned by the “Fed Zone” United States, which itself has said domicile as indicated by 4 U.S.C. §72. HOWEVER, there is no consensual connection between the OFFICE and the alleged but not actual OFFICER, who the government falsely alleged is me, the Petitioner. A vacant civil office under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(1) and 15 U.S.C. §77b(a)(2) has no domicile until it is VOLUNTARILY filled, and the Petitioner never consented to fill it and vehemently denies that I can be COMPELLED to fill it without violating the Thirteenth Amendment and international human trafficking laws. The obligations attached to the civil status of “person” that the Prosecutors are trying to FORCE onto me, in fact, represent property and services STOLEN or extorted through duress from the Petitioner by the Prosecution in my case. As the absolute owner of myself and those services and obligations, I therefore, as a Merchant (U.C.C. §2-104(1), have a right to set the terms or cost they have to pay to procure those services as the Buyer, and the terms are describe in my: *Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement*, Form #06.027; <https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranchInjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>.<sup>2</sup> Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

I repeat, I am not the debtor, **I'm the creditor!** This is **equity**. If the Prosecution refuses to pay for those services and obligations it alleges on my part, it is guilty of criminal identity theft, 18 U.S.C. §912 and becomes an involuntary trustee/fiduciary of mine (California Civil Code Section 2224) until it RETURNS their value. The bible says such brazen and even court-sanctioned THIEVERY is punishable by AT LEAST TWO TIMES its value, *Exodus 22:7* and *Rev. 18:6*, which means they must pay DOUBLE the cost that I, as the original absolute owner, set in the above agreement. For the Prosecution to respond that they don't have to return the value of property they STOLE from me (and the rest of the Bitclub members), is for them to admit they are ANARCHISTS, which ironically is what they falsely accuse me of being! Not only are they Anarchists but they are also literal Pirates in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1652 and 18 U.S.C. § 1661! Remember, the IRS requires THIEVES to pay taxes on their ill-gotten gains and stolen goods too. See: *United States v. Sullivan*, 274 U.S. 259 (1927) and the Revenue Act of 1921. Should I not 1099 or W4 the prosecution team for all the Bitcoin that they have stolen from me? Rights are property and my right to bail and a trial were denied without due process! I can never get the time I sat in jail, my stellar reputation the mockingbird media dragged through the mud, and lost opportunities back that they stole from me. That's the “law” isn't it? The court may allow them to get away with their theft and not have to pay taxes on the proceeds, but the IRS may still want a cut. Come to think of it, are you all paying taxes on the money you're making off trading these bonds? I doubt

---

<sup>2</sup> “The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over the use of his own property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated or implied in the legislation authorizing its grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The recipient of the privilege, in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the privilege conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the compensation for it.” [Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)]

it. Isn't it interesting that the IRS wants to receive the commercial benefit and get a clip off the proceeds of crimes people commit!? It's a maxim of law that "one should not be able to benefit from illegal acts" yet here the IRS is, literally condoning these illegal acts so they can profit from them. Once the Plaintiff/IRS starts profiting from crime, they obviously are going to want more of it! Right? Houston, we have a problem! Just have a read of the book *3 Felonies a Day* sometime. Adding 50,000 new laws, codes, regulations and statutes to the books each year will eventually make EVERYONE a "criminal". That's a wonderful thing for those making billions of dollars off the prison industrial complex, tearing apart families so they can literally warehouse their fellow man... It's evil...

Lucky for us private Americans who aren't members of your "club", it's mandatory that ALL civil statuses MUST be voluntary. And I choose not to participate! **I object to you trying to enslave me with adhesion contracts.** I do not consent! I do not want to contract with you at all. "A party cannot be bound by a contract that he has not made or authorized." Alexander v. Bosworth (1915), 26 C.A. 589, 599, 147 P.607. "The intention of one party does not make contract." Barrios & Co. v. Pettigrew (G. V.) Co. (1924), 68 C.A. 139, 228 P. 676.

For more proof read: *Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status*, Form #13.008;  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf>. Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

- F. Since a predicate civil status of "person" is involved in the alleged "crimes", then even though this is a "criminal" matter for the 18 U.S.C. §371 count, it is still a civil matter insofar as it depends on a voluntary civil office of "person" for the 26 U.S.C. §7201 count and the 15 U.S.C. §77x count. Thus, the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) applies to this case as a tool for dismissing all quasi-criminal allegations. There you have it.

See: *IRS Fraud and Deception About the Statutory Word "Person"*

<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/IRSPerson.pdf> Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

- G. There is nothing I could do to ameliorate the alleged but not proven damages caused because of Bitclub wanting to be compliant with U.S. KYC rules by the other accused. (Even though Bitclub wasn't even allowing US CITIZENS to join by blocking US IP addresses) Bitclub locked me out of my own account until I completed the process. That should show you clearly how little control I had with the inner workings of Bitclub. **I was just a member. If Bitclub was a scam, I would be a victim too!**

All the parties in the United States who could conceivably claim an injury had to knowingly and deliberately violate the Bitclub member agreement, which was clearly laid out on the website and use a VPN to bypass internet filtering rules that Bitclub had in place. Therefore, their own behavior was the only cause of any alleged damages they may have or might claim. Not the petitioners. Think about it, if someone from America wants to gamble online, but the

casino in Amsterdam blocks US IP addresses, the easy work around that the STATUTORY “US CITIZEN” can implement is to use a VPN to change the IP address to one in Europe. This is common knowledge. If he does that, and then goes to the casino website and loses \$100, it’s not the casinos fault is it? Of course not. The casino blocked US ip addresses so as to thwart Americans from, God forbid, gambling. They shouldn’t have gone to the casino as a statutory US CITIZEN (8 U.S.C. §1401 or 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c)) in the first place. It’s literally the same in this scenario.

3. There could be no conspiracy by the Petitioner to cause the harm alleged but not proven in the defective indictment, because I was not the cause or decision maker or principal in anything that Bitclub did regarding the defective indictment or the alleged harm that resulted from the acts or omissions of the other accused who owned and operated the club. Remember, an indictment isn’t evidence. I could have easily nipped this in the bud had I been invited to testify to the grand jury. Which is probably why I wasn’t invited...
4. Even pleading guilty to a violation of 18 U.S.C. §371 would not ameliorate harm that I was not the proven cause of. All it would do is help fund a case that clearly is an injustice as far as my involvement is concerned. Thus, by me not withdrawing the plea I submitted under duress, I would be funding and protecting criminal activity by the officers of this court.
5. Consequently, this court has **NO JURISDICTION** to join me, the Petitioner to this case/conspiracy and **must dismiss** the trust immediately from this case. That’s the easiest way to end this mockery of justice.

#### **STILL DON’T UNDERSTAND?**

To make this as simple as possible to understand. Compare what I’m saying to how the NFL (National Football League) works. The “league” has different “franchises” or teams, like the Broncos or Patriots. John Elway, who was my favorite football player, decided to join the NFL because he was really good at football. He voluntarily signed the contract to join a “franchise” or “team” like “The Broncos.” There are different “offices” or “positions” that he could fill. Like the office of “Quarter Back”, “Running Back” or “Wide Receiver.” As most of us remember, he filled the office or position of “Quarter Back” for the franchise team, “The Broncos” in the league, “The NFL”. Now a bunch of new rules or “NFL Laws” apply to him that don’t apply to us flag football players who like to play football at the neighborhood park. NFL rules don’t apply to us because we never signed the NFL franchise contract to join the league to begin with. We are out of the jurisdiction of the NFL. Now, if Elway breaks those NFL rules/codes/statutes/bylaws, he will get suspended for x number of games or fined x number of dollars etc. If he doesn’t like the rules of the league, he can always step down and retire from the league. The “office” of quarter back is the property of the broncos franchise, not John Elway. So, they slide someone else into that office/position, like Peyton Manning, who then went on to win them a Super Bowl Championship! Does this make sense? Trying to force NFL “club rules” via adhesion contracts, onto someone who never joined the NFL is preposterous. It’s the same in this scenario.

Since this is so abstract for most people to understand, another way to think about it is, men and women have a right to grow their hair as long as they want because they own themselves. Their body is their property. But, if that living man signs a contract to become a police “officer” now all these new rules apply to him that don’t apply to those of us who are not police officers. He can’t grow his hair long and he has to wear a uniform with a shiny badge and carry a gun. The government can tell that “officer” what to do and how to dress, which would normally violate his constitutional rights, but because he has a “right to contract” and he decided to voluntarily sign the employment agreement to become an “officer” so he can have the “benefit” of a job, then it’s now ok to violate his constitutional rights. If he doesn’t like the terms of employment, he can give up the benefit of having a job as a police officer and quit. Now he can go back to private civilian life and grow his hair as long as he wants!

Private Citizens cannot have their property searched without probable cause (4th Amendment) BUT, in many circumstances, government employees can have their property searched without a warrant per their terms of employment.

Private Citizens cannot be punished for refusing to provide the government information that may incriminate themselves (5th Amendment) but government employees can be dismissed/fired when the incriminating information that they refuse to provide relates to the performance of their job. That’s why, YOU, as an unknowing officer called a “taxpayer”, filing a 1040 form, isn’t a violation of the 5th amendment... where it would **obviously be a violation of 5th Amendment to force a private citizen to file a 1040. Because filing that form, can incriminate you and you have a right to not incriminate yourself.** It’s against the constitution to force Americans to file a 1040. However, they say it is “legal” to require the fictional Fed Zone STATUTORY “US CITIZEN” office/franchise to file one. However, was it legal for them to fraudulently deceive you and convert you into one of their officers/trustees without your knowledge and consent? Obviously not! And that is why I chose NOT to be a 8 USC 1401 statutory US CITIZEN and instead live my life as a living man, operating in the private. Here is the evidence:

*Why It's a Crime for a Private state national to File a 1040 Income Tax Return, Form #08.021*

<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/WhyCrimefileReturn.pdf> Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

With regard to freedom of speech in particular. (1st Amendment) Private Citizens cannot be punished for speech of merely private concern but government employees can be fired for that reason.

Same with social media. We have free speech as humans, but when you create a virtual profile of yourself, a digital identity... on Facebook lets say, and you agree to their terms of service, you now do NOT have free speech. You have to follow their “hate speech” rules etc. This is being argued in the courts right now. I have had “my” Facebook account suspended many times because of their active censorship of truth. However, it’s their platform and private property and they have a right to control their property any way they see fit. Ownership and control are synonymous, in fact. We don’t “own” our Facebook profile.

They do and its on loan to us when we use their platform with “legal strings” attached. (Remember those terms and conditions you clicked “I agree” to?) That’s why they can delete people off their platform if those people don’t follow their censorship rules so... if we are to respect property rights, then they have a right to set the terms of use of their platform and censor whomever they want and we have a choice to #OptOut and stop using their platform. It’s the same in this scenario. I want nothing to do with your slave surveillance CBDC (Central Bank Digital Currency) fiat money society/platform. I stand in Gods Kingdom. I am living my life in his “sand box”. I am not a member of the Babylonian Matrix “sand box” you all live in. I.e. The Devil's Kingdom. You have no jurisdiction over me the living man. I am your master and you are my servant. **You cannot cross over.**

### **3.2. Defective Indictment Re Petitioner**

1. First, to be abundantly clear, this notice establishes that this is a trust action against the cardholder account. The JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS trust was indicted, not me the living man.
  - A. The so-called “indictment” or presentment or “TRUE BILL” is a security instrument, and it is fraudulent and not binding. Defects include:
    - i. The required grand jury foreman’s signature. The grand jury’s signature is a requirement for the indictment to be valid according to Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(c). **Where is it?**
    - ii. Additionally, there is no indication that any witnesses testified before the Grand Jury as the security instrument (indictment) does not denote summons for witnesses. And as we already know, attorneys can’t be witnesses.
    - iii. The people who sat on the Grand Jury and the **judge herself do NOT meet the residency requirement.** According to the 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment, there is a residency requirement to be a juror and judge. They must PHYSICALLY live in the DISTRICT for Federal cases. Meaning they must live on Federal territory or a federal enclave, **not state land.** A failure to satisfy this requirement upon the judge is high misdemeanor as identified in the **Judicial Code of 1940.** The provision of the code doing this was CONVENIENTLY not codified into Title 28 by the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives, but nevertheless **it STILL applies because it was not explicitly repealed.** That’s pretty shady if you ask me! Therefore, this pleading constitutes a demand for the oath of office and proof of physical residence on federal territory within New Jersey by the judge, and a CRIMINAL COMPLAINT if that burden of proof is not satisfied.

It’s easy to indict someone FEDERALLY in Puerto Rico because the whole island is a federal territory/ possession. Everyone on the island meets the residency requirement. Same with Washington D.C. Everyone there lives in the “District” of Columbia thus they meet the residency requirement. However, to indict someone **Federally**, if one of those jurors lives at 123 Main Street in downtown Newark, he/she lives on STATE land, not

Federal land. Thus, the juror doesn't meet the residency requirement to serve as a juror in Federal Court because they don't live in the district as the 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment demands. There is no geographical "district of New Jersey" because **it would violate the Separation of Powers Doctrine**. Federal land within a state of the union like New Jersey is called an "enclave". A post office, or military base or National Park or federal courthouse, IF IT WAS CEDED TO THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT BY THE STATE, would be considered an enclave. I doubt all the jurors who served on the grand jury to indict the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS trust physically lived at the post office, courthouse or on BLM land... Plus, those people serving on the grand jury are not "of my peers" because I'm not from NJ, I don't live there, and I don't do business there. Further, the jury selection pool derives inappropriately from those LICENSED to "drive" on public roadways within federal enclaves, and none of the jurors likely qualify to receive said licenses in the first place. The jurors couldn't be any more incompatible with my circumstances and therefore are NOT my peers. This isn't rocket science. The defective indictment should be thrown out! Is it really that hard for the government to just follow the law of the land, i.e., the Constitution?

See the evidence for yourselves:

[What Happened to Justice?](https://sedm.org/ItemInfo/Ebooks/WhatHappJustice/WhatHappJustice.htm) <https://sedm.org/ItemInfo/Ebooks/WhatHappJustice/WhatHappJustice.htm>

- B. Admittedly, if government property was involved that was not physically located on federal territory but was within the exterior limits of the judicial district of New Jersey, this court would have jurisdiction over offenses involving said physical property under Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution. The government in this case, however, does not allege that the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS TRUST, who is the subject of this proceeding, mismanaged any government property. The burden of proof upon the Plaintiff /U.S.A. is to demonstrate:
  - i. The trust/office is lawfully and consensually occupied by a living man or woman who IS surety for the trust. If not, criminal identity theft by Plaintiff and the Judge against me the living man is hereby complained of under 18 U.S.C. §912.
  - ii. SPECIFIC physical or chattel government property was damaged or misused by the trust.
  - iii. That U.S.A/Plaintiff had title to the property. If not, they are engaging in embezzlement of private, constitutionally protected property owned by ME in violation of 18 U.S.C. §654. Property of mine includes my rights, my body, and the fruits of my labor, which this Court is unconstitutionally HIJACKING and stealing from me for private gain as part of this "frivolous" trust proceeding "conspiracy theory". Without satisfying the above burden of proof, there is no cognizable offense to begin with.
- 2. When you read the 27 page long defective indictment it only mentions THE TRUST (and NOT me the man) twice. Both times I'm asking the owners of Bitclub to be more transparent and to do the right thing. **How do you get indicted for**

**encouraging people to do the right thing and never the wrong or illegal thing to begin with?** To their credit, my lawyers were flabbergasted. They told me that over the decades of practicing law as U.S. Prosecutors themselves, they had never seen anyone get indicted for asking people to do the right thing! Yet I was somehow bundled into this mess. No good deed goes unpunished, eh? To the persecutors, you shouldn't try to punish people for doing the right thing!!

3. I joined Bitclub 16 months after it started, as member, just like the million other people from around the world who did the same. I joined as a natural flesh and blood living man, not a legal fiction "person". I didn't start Bitclub or own or operate Bitclub. I was a member of this private membership association (PMA) along with a million other folks. I shared the opportunity with my close friends and family like everyone else. If Bitclub was a fraud, then I would be a victim too. I didn't believe it was a fraud because I went to the data centers and verified that they were doing was what they said they were doing, mining Bitcoin. I knew they were spending the Bitcoin that the members sent to them on mining hardware because I in fact arranged for them to trade the Bitcoin for computer equipment for that very purpose. Bitclub didn't use money and didn't touch the US financial system. It was a simple trade. **You have no jurisdiction.** And besides, there is no way I would knowingly and willingly rip off my mom and dad, aunts and uncles, friends and loved ones! If I knew it was a fraud, why would I trade my bitcoin for mining equipment to hash into the Bitclub mining pool myself? I put my own Bitcoin into it. The prosecutor's "frivolous conspiracy theory" is NOT believable. It's inconsistent with their own evidence. With humility I can state that I've done my best to live my entire adult life above reproach. I've never intentionally caused harm to anyone. There isn't one person who knows me who believes any of the lies the government/plaintiff has spewed. **Dozens** of influential people, including **Congressman Ron Paul**, known as the most honest statesmen our country has had in the last 100 years, wrote letters to the judge on my behalf, testifying to my character and integrity! Yet, unbelievably, the Magistrate took the word of the prosecutors, who don't even know me and are not qualified to even be witnesses, over the many character witnesses who came to my rescue who DO know and respect me! Why?? Why would Magistrate Hammer break the law by throwing out the testimony of prominent witnesses and instead take the word of "non witnesses" and deny me my right to bail? Doesn't seem very "fair, balanced and just" does it?

Ron Paul  
Former Member of Congress  
U.S. House of Representatives  
220 Blackstock Lane - Lake Jackson, TX 77566

March 20, 2020

To: US Magistrate Judge Edward S. Kiel  
US District Judge Claire C. Cecchi

Regarding: Joby Weeks

I have known Joby since 2008 when he volunteered to work, without pay, in my presidential campaign. Since then I have come to know both Joby and his wife Stephanie. For advice and support they came to Texas for the birth of their daughter. The entire family has visited my home on several occasions.

Joby is a true believer in the libertarian "Freedom Philosophy" of self-responsibility and in the rejection of the initiation of force and violence. This belief includes the obligation to be true to one's word.

I have known Joby for twelve years and never encountered any problems with him or his relations with others. He was a dedicated well-mannered volunteer.

It is my opinion that if Joby is granted bail, he will fulfill his promises and legal obligations.

Sincerely,

*Ron Paul*  
Ron Paul, M.D.

4. When Bitclub started mining Bitcoin, the value of Bitcoin skyrocketed! Just as I had predicted. It was amazing! The government says that none of Bitcoin the members gave to Bitclub went to buy physical computer equipment. Yet they have the receipts that prove the equipment was acquired and video evidence of the data centers full of computers mining Bitcoin! It's on the blockchain for the whole world to see. Bitclub was one of the biggest bitcoin mining private membership associations on the planet. **The prosecutors committed a sin of omission when they failed to mention that Bitclub mined with the equipment they acquired, over 92,000 Bitcoins and a 500,000 Etherium, that they then shared with their members.** Bitclub also gave away millions of their own crypto currency, Club Coin, for free to the Bitclub members as a bonus, kind of like the airlines do with frequent flyer miles! Being correct about Bitcoin should be praised not punished! They lie and said that no mining was taking place and that we stole \$700m, when Bitclub didn't even use dollars to begin with!! **And then they pulled an armed home invasion, stole my property and kidnapped me for 5 years!! Unbelievable!** Everything is transparent and on the blockchain for the world to see. Every satoshi is accounted for. How can you take the governments word as "truth" when they lead everyone to believe that there was no

computer equipment, no data centers... that there was no mining taking place? That Bitclub was just a huge "Ponzi Scam", like Socialist Security System that the plaintiff is currently running... None of that is true. Yet, when I google my name, it looks like I stole \$700m dollars! These defamatory labels that they projected upon me in media of all forms all over the world like "anarchist", "Ponzi scammer", "fraudster", "cult leader" etc... destroyed my presumption of innocence, dehumanized me and turned me into stigmatized individual. Violating the presumption of innocence is an illegal act. They did that using the "guilt by association" tactic that information terrorists commonly use by bundling me to a "conspiracy theory" that I shouldn't have been bundled into to begin with and then the constant non stop negative press releases to destroy my name and reputation 5 mins after I was arrested.

5. Plus, **Bitclub didn't even use dollars!** Don't you think that if the prosecutors' lies were true and I really stole all that Bitcoin or \$700m dollars... that I would be dead by now? I've been out on bail for 4 years! My 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment right to defend myself from violent criminals has been stolen from me... I'm a sitting duck for someone who would want to take revenge. Especially now since the Democrats want to use the **BATF (Duns and Bradstreet #132282310)** to disarm everyone and defund the local police, so I'm totally defenseless! People kill each other every day over a few thousand dollars. So, why am I still alive if I truly stole \$700m dollars? Give me a break!
  
6. In fact, to prove my point, Bitclub sent me thousands of Bitcoins to acquire some computer equipment for one of their data centers. The prosecutors know this! If I was a thief and a fraud like the Prosecutors say, don't you think I would have just kept the Bitcoin they sent me and disappeared? That's what most thieves would do if given the opportunity isn't it? **If I actually stole thousands of Bitcoins, I would expect the treatment that I have been getting from the persecutors, but I didn't!** I did what I said I would do which is why I'm still trusted by many people based only on my word and a handshake. My good name and reputation it took me 40+ years to build has been WILLFULLY SLANDERED by the Department of Injustice because of these lies the prosecution team has spread to those who don't know me personally. Thankfully, the hundreds of people who have come to visit me, from all over the world, while sitting here on house arrest, don't believe a thing the prosecutors say and are still willing to be friends with me and do business with me. That's one of the perks of living a life that is above reproach. How many people can you trust with thousands of Bitcoins? I'm one of the most trustworthy people on the planet. I always do what I say I'm going to do no matter how much Bitcoin is on the line. No matter how badly the prosecution tries to lie and damage my reputation and put me on the defensive to get free inadmissible evidence, (I was forced to give them 15 hours of proffering under duress) none of the people who know me believe anything they say. I would never try to damage the reputation of someone that I knew harmed no one. Yet they have no qualms about it. John 10:10 says, "The devil comes to steal, kill and destroy." Who steals more money than the IRS? Who kills more people than the military industrial complex? Who destroys more lives and tears more families apart than the prison industrial complex? So... who is the devil? And who do the prosecutors work for?

7. When I was doing my due diligence on Bitclub, I, along with 200 other people, went to Iceland to see one of their data centers filled with computer equipment and to meet the founders. They told me what price they were buying the computer equipment for when I asked them. I told them I might be able to get them a better price from some friends of mine at Bitfury. (A bitcoin mining hardware company) I ended up saving the Bitclub members about 3000 Bitcoins off the cost of what they were buying it for from Bitmain. (A different Bitcoin mining hardware company)
8. Bitclub then told me that they were paying for power to run the data centers. I found them power for half price. I ended up saving Bitclub members at least 2000 Bitcoins on the power bill.
9. Just by getting involved with Bitclub as a member and now victim because of illegal government intervention, **I saved my fellow members/victims of the government at least 5000 Bitcoins had I not otherwise joined.** How could that be construed as me harming the members? I AM a member/victim! **How would there be any restitution for me to pay “the victims” when I saved my fellow Bitclub members/victims 5000 Bitcoins?** None of this makes any sense. **It’s time to dismiss me from this case and leave me alone!**
10. Now remember that the equipment the Bitclub members purchased was mining around 50 Bitcoins a day. Well, the government shut Bitclub down more than 1800 days ago. Do the math. Thats close to a 100,000 Bitcoin loss that we members/victims have taken **because of government intervention.** Think about that. The government cost Bitclub members, whom they claim they are protecting CONSERVATIVELY 100,000 Bitcoins in lost revenue!!!! What did the government do with the members/victim’s computer equipment? **The government is still sitting on thousands of the members/victim’s confiscated Bitcoin to boot!** Remember, it’s all on the blockchain for the world to see. You can’t hide it. When is the government going to allow the victims to log back into their accounts and withdraw their Bitcoin? **That is theft perpetrated by the government/plaintiff, plain and simple.** They are doing the opposite of what we the people created them to do! They did the same with the Silk Road. Not everyone on the Silk Road was selling drugs. Yet the government came in and stole it all anyways! So, who is really creating the victims here? Me (a member/victim) or the covetous thieving government/plaintiff? I saved my fellow Bitclub members at least 5000 Bitcoins. The government cost Bitclub victims at least 100,000 Bitcoins in losses! My actions as a member/victim/vendor harmed no one. The government's actions... not so much. If the government would NOT have tried to illegally intervene, Bitclub would still be mining Bitcoin and the members would still be getting paid. What a shame. Why did the government not handle this Bitclub fiasco like they handled the EOS Initial Coin Offering, which raised \$4 billion dollars and then got slapped on wrist with a \$24m fine because some Americans slipped through the cracks and, God forbid, they voluntarily bought some tokens... <https://www.sec.gov/news/press-release/2019-202> A \$24m fine / \$4b is a penalty of .006% of what they raised. Not one person was kidnapped and tortured by the government. Now calculate .006% of the Bitcoin that Bitclub took in. Wow. Am I the only one who can see the hypocrisy here? Government intervention cost the victims over 100,000 Bitcoins

in damages!! Tell me why a class action lawsuit on behalf of the members/victims against the government/plaintiff is not in order! Their actions have caused some serious damage to the victims, me included, who was then kidnapped, jailed and denied my right to bail and a trial for going on 5 years now!

11. When I found out from two different sources in the intelligence community that there was a federal investigation going on, did I flee to a non-extradition country to live out the rest of my life in luxury? Most guilty criminals would have done that. I had plenty of Bitcoin to live on as nonresident alien (not a “U.S. person”), my own airplane, **a diplomatic passport**, billionaire friends to hang out with etc... **No, I didn’t flee!** Instead I had my friends who work in the intelligence community arrange a meeting with the investigating agents of the government so I could try and clarify their misunderstandings. Yet, after they arrested me, at a meeting I had set up with the agents myself, after having sold my airplane, after my passport was confiscated, after my computers and a fortune worth of crypto was confiscated, the prosecution tricked the magistrate in Florida into thinking that I was a “flight risk” with their lies so they could violate my rights and deny me bail and a trial. Seriously? Think about it. How could I be a flight risk, when I had no passport, no airplane and not much Bitcoin left to live on and Covid had the entire world shut down? Where and how would I flee? I already proved that I was willing to co-operate with the investigators that I had met with and stayed in contact with, yet I was still denied my right to bail and a trial because of their lies. This is wrong on so many levels. Exodus 20:19 “*You shall NOT bear false witness against your neighbor.*” Gods law trumps all law! The prosecutors are not above Gods laws. The prosecutors never called any witnesses at my multiple bail hearings to testify that I was a flight risk. And we already know, they aren’t supposed to be “witnesses”, let alone false witnesses to begin with!

### **3.3. *Government Fabricated Alleged Conspiracy Theory to Sell Unregistered “Securities” under 18 U.S.C. §371***

1. In the plea bargain submitted under criminal duress, I was forced to admit to a criminal conspiracy theory “to sell” unregistered securities under 18 U.S.C. §371, and 15 U.S.C. §§77e and 77x. This fabrication is clearly ridiculous/frivolous and completely nonsensical, as I will explain below.
2. **MY CONVERSATION WITH THE SEC:** While on bail, my puppy cut herself trying to crawl under the fence. She needed \$1500 USD worth of stitches. I was inclined to instead pay \$200 to put her down since cash has been tight for our family since having our assets stolen by the government without due process. (A violation of the 5th Amendments “takings clause”) It’s hard to provide for my family when I’m not allowed to go anywhere or do anything, can’t have a phone or computer, can’t have a bank account or use crypto etc per the ridiculous bail terms imposed on me... However, my two friends liked my dog and offered to chip in \$500 each to save her life with the agreement that if she has some puppies, that we split the cash from the sale of the puppies 3 ways so that they could be made whole. I agreed but I told them that if that were to happen, we would also have also split the cost of the dog food too. They agreed. **I then called the SEC and spoke**

**to the Ombudsman representative.** I explained that I needed to figure out how to turn my puppy into a “registered security” because I didn’t want to get into trouble for selling an “unregistered security.” The representative laughed and said that I didn’t need to register the puppy as a security. I said “Ok, that’s odd because the persecutors want people to believe that computer equipment, a physical product, like a puppy, is somehow a security”. If three of us put in 1 bitcoin each to buy a bitcoin mining computer or a puppy, and we split the power bill or puppy food bill 3 ways and we split the bitcoin that is mined or the puppies that are born 3 ways. How is it magically presumed to be a “security” if it’s computer equipment but not a security if it’s a puppy? What? It’s the same thing! That’s literally what the JOBADIAH WEEKS TRUST is being charged with... selling an unregistered security when in fact **I was just trading Bitcoin for computer equipment...** If, according to the SEC, I don’t have to register my puppy as a security, why would the prosecutors want you to believe that I need to register computer equipment as a security? Is it so they can use this precedent setting case to justify a brute force approach for an unlawful expansion of their jurisdiction, committing an emolument violation, so they can try to regulate private agreements between consenting members of a private membership association? They don’t have jurisdiction over PMAs that don’t touch their financial system and don’t use their “money” to begin with, plain and simple. And even if the SEC did have jurisdiction, wouldn’t the officers/owners of Bitclub be responsible for registering paperwork with the SEC? It’s not the role or responsibility of members/victims like me to do that in the first place! Your honor, you must dismiss me from this case! Trying to destroy someones life over this is not fair or just. Especially since I harmed NO ONE! This has been going on for 5 years! Enough!

3. **There wasn’t one member that I referred to Bitclub who believed they were trading Bitcoin for a “security”. Not one member asked for share certificates after joining the club. Not one member believed they were buying stock in a company. We all knew Bitclub wasn’t a company to begin with but a private membership association. There was NO stock offered to the public to buy in Bitclub!** We knew that what we were trading our Bitcoin for was physical bitcoin mining hardware. We knew that Bitclub would host our equipment in the data centers they had set up around the world and if we ever wanted to take delivery of our equipment, we would just send Bitclub an email asking them to **ship us our equipment.** Bitclub sent many of us our equipment back to us when asked. **That evidence destroys the prosecutions “he was selling unregistered securities” frivolous conspiracy theory presumption.** Plus, and I know that I’m beating a dead horse here, but Bitclub was a Private Membership Association (PMA) that handles its own legal affairs and doesn’t burden this court. It wasn’t a company. It didn’t deal with the public. Members only! The SEC/Government has no right to dictate what private membership organizations do with private men and women. Doing so **violates our constitutionally protected right to contract** and associate with each other which violates the takings clause of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment. Remember, contract is law and law is contract! Just have a read **Hale v. Henke** 201 U.S. 74 (1906): *"The [private] individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a Citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in*

his own way. **His power to contract is unlimited.** (joining a PMA like Bitclub) He owes no duty to the State (to file a 1040 or SEC paperwork) or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him. **He owes no such duty to the State,** since he receives nothing there from beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by (civil) **due process of law**, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." The court further declared in supra, 74-75 regarding 8 U.S.C. 1401 "U.S. Citizens" which includes all "Corporate Citizens"-- "Upon the other hand, the corporation (i.e. U.S. "persons") is a creature of the State. It is presumed to be incorporated for the benefit of the public. It receives certain special privileges and franchises and holds them subject to the laws of the State and the limitations of its charter. Its powers are limited by law. It can make no contract not authorized by its charter. Its rights to act as a corporation are only preserved to it so long as it obeys the laws of its creation (like filing a 1040 or filing SEC paperwork). There is a reserved right in the legislature to investigate its contracts and find out whether it has exceeded its powers." **Bitclub wasn't a corporation chartered by the state and thus it was not required to follow any of the state's statutes that are directed towards corporations.** However, even if it were a company, it's easy to smash the frivolous conspiracy theory spewed by the prosecution team. All I must do is look up their own definitions to do so. Keep reading so it sinks in or just save time and dismiss me from this case!

---

4. To confirm the above suspicions, I also examined the definition of "security" in 15 U.S.C.S §77b(a)(1) and 15 U.S.C.S. §77c(a)(10) and determined for myself that what Bitclub (even if it was a company under the jurisdiction of the SEC) was selling could definitely not be "securities" as legally defined, for the following reasons:
  - A. The SEC told me it wasn't a security when I called and asked them. What was being TRADED FOR BITCOIN and not OFFERED was a stake in physical computer hardware, and not a mere "investment". Physical computer hardware is NOWHERE listed in the above definitions of "security". The buyers either owned a mining unit entirely or a specific timeshare of the unit out of a 24-hour period.
    - i. There were no shared accounts whereby people bought "units of participation" in said accounts. *Investment Co. Institute v. Camp, 274 F.Supp. 624, 1967 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9343 (D.D.C. 1967)* , rev'd, *Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 2438, 420 F.2d. 83, 136 U.S.App.D.C. 241, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P92438 (D.C. Cir. 1969)*
    - ii. There were no "investment contracts" and whereby there was an "expectation of profits to be derived solely from efforts of others". The hardware directly owned and used by the owner produced the Bitcoin, not others. *SEC v.*

*Shiner, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P 92430, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 2430, 268 F.Supp.2d. 1333, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 92430, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P92430, 2003 U.S.Dist.LEXIS 15606 (S.D.Fla. 2003).*

- B. The equipment being traded for Bitcoin was NOT available to “persons” in the “United States” the country. All USA IP addresses were blocked by the security firewall because, I assume, that Bitclub did not want to be the target of regulation of transactions by the U.S. Government. However, the decision to block US CITIZENS from joining was not my decision or recommendation, **it was made independently by the Bitclub owners without my participation as a member.** This may have been why they chose the Private Membership Association (PMA) route instead of the “let’s go public on the stock exchange” route.
- C. No “note” or “certificate” or “promissory note” or “unit of participation” against a shared account was issued or distributed after Bitcoin was paid by the purchasers of mining hardware. Keep in mind that Bitcoin, not dollars, were used in the transaction. **Bitclub didn’t touch the US financial system.**
- D. Beyond the point of sale of the mining hardware, there were no recurring usage fees billed to the owner of the hardware. The electricity to run the hardware was derived from a small portion of the Bitcoin it produced.
- E. Those procuring the hardware or timeshare on the hardware could sell it back to other members, or take delivery of their equipment, without “redeeming” or selling a “note” or “certificate” or “unit of participation” in a shared account.
- F. The output of the use of the computing hardware was INFORMATION. That information had economic value to a specific audience, and therefore could only be classified as “property” and NEVER a “security”. **But nowhere is that type of property listed as “money!” in the Constitution. Bitcoin isn’t money! The only type of money the Constitution recognizes is gold and silver coins.** Look up the definition of money for yourself in Black’s Law Dictionary, 6<sup>th</sup> addition, page 1005. *“Money: In usual and ordinary acceptation means coins and paper currency used as a circulating medium of exchange, and does NOT embrace notes, bonds, evidence of debt or other personal or real estate”*. In contrast, the “money” the “plaintiff” SEC regulators love, i.e. “Federal Reserve Notes” (FRN’s) are not actually lawful “money” as constitutionally defined to begin with and neither is Bitcoin. In fact, believe it or not, F.R.N.s aren’t even promissory “notes” because notes have to have a maker, a payee, a due date and dollar amount. On the front of an FRN it says “This note is legal tender (not lawful money) for all debts “public” and “private” ... So, why does a F.R.N say it’s a note if it’s not a lawful note? **Is that not fraud?** Why isn’t the government prosecuting themselves? Did you notice that there are 2 sides to a “FRN”? A Public and Private side? That’s evidenced by the 2 signatures on them. One for the “Treasurer of the United States” and the other for the “Secretary of Treasury”? The Secretary of Treasury is also the Governor of the (IMF) International Monetary Fund. That makes it the public side to the actual U.S. Treasury. Which then means the Treasurer of the United States would be the actual Treasurer of the private side. So, an FRN is a negotiable instrument with interest on the public side and a non-negotiable demand

“note” without interest on the private side... The SEC/Treasury “plaintiffs” Fed Note Fraud continues... According to Modern Money Mechanics by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, these “regulated” banks don’t “lend” you money to buy a house or a car, **they buy your promissory note**. So why do they call it a “loan” if they aren’t loaning any money? **Calling it a loan is fraud.** When you go to the bank and give them your paycheck you are not “depositing” it into an account to be held safely in trust, you’re actually “loaning” the bank your earnings so they can do with it what they please. **Calling it a deposit is fraud!** When the Fed creates trillions of dollars “out of thin air” via bonds and hypothecation, the result is that the dollar becomes worth less and less. **Inflation is theft.** That’s why counterfeiting money is a crime, because debasing the currency creates victims out of whomever is using that currency because the purchasing power has been diminished. If you or I did it, we would be thrown in jail... **Yet the “plaintiff” does it every day!** Allowing this to continue makes the SEC/IRS et al a party to the fraud. Oh, what tangled webs we weave when first we practice to deceive. Please explain to me why you’re going after me when this stuff is happening right under your nose. What the people need is an asset that cannot be debased, running on a network that cannot be stopped, governed by a protocol that cannot be corrupted. **That asset is Bitcoin.** (Which is NOT money) I guess with all the “SEC/IRS/Federal Reserve fraud” the “plaintiff” is involved in really doesn’t matter because, at the end of the day, Bitclub didn’t accept FRN “money” anyways. Just pointing out the hypocrisy. They only accepted Bitcoin (property) for payment of the computer equipment (property). Property for property, get it? Bitclub, as a nonresident alien, (PMA) didn’t touch the U.S. Financial system. You have no jurisdiction! The “property” (Bitcoin) was produced by the mining hardware, which is a physical product and NOT a security, which was owned and controlled by the participant and NOT others.

- G. If ANYONE is running a security fraud, it would have to be the “Fed Zone” U.S.A. Inc. for offering worthless paper as REAL “securities” to shareholders and involuntary public officers called STATUTORY “U.S. Citizens” or “taxpayers”. Why isn’t the Department of Injustice prosecuting itself for running the biggest Ponzi Scam in the history of the world? Yet they falsely accuse me of running a ponzi scam so I can harm who? Myself?! That doesn’t make sense. They knew I didn’t create, own or operate Bitclub. The prosecutors are taking a page right out of Joseph Goebbel’s, head of Nazi propaganda, play book. He said, “Accuse the other side of that which you are guilty”. Is that not what they are doing in this case? Mislabeling Bitclub as a “ponzi scam” while simultaneously running the biggest ACTUAL ponzi scam in history. (Socialist Security) The government has been caught doing this countless times... *“If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it. The lie can be maintained only for such time as the State can shield the people from the political, economic and/or military consequences of the lie. It thus becomes vitally important for the State to use all of its powers to repress dissent, for the truth is the mortal*

enemy of the lie, and thus by extension, the truth is the greatest enemy of the State”.

Read about the biggest scam in history! <https://artofliberty.org/download/6724/?tmstv=1735252159>

H. I can find no caselaw which ever identifies physical electronic hardware as a “security”. It doesn’t exist.

5. Under the “**risk capital test**”, there was no risk involved because there was no investment, but a mere trade of Bitcoin for computer hardware that naturally depreciates over time. *Great Western Bank & Trust v. Kotz, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P 95494, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 5494, 532 F.2d. 1252, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 95494, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P95494, 1976 U.S.App. LEXIS 12283 (9th Cir. 1976).*
6. Under the “**common enterprise test**”, the purchase of a physical asset such as a yacht does not constitute an “investment contract” or a “security” within the meaning of 15 U.S.C.S. §§77b(1) or 78c(a)(10). Thus, the common ownership of physical computing hardware of yacht does not satisfy the common enterprise test. It is more of a bailment than an investment. *Deckebach v. La Vida Charters, Inc., Fed. Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P. 94182, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) ¶ 4182, 867 F.2d. 278, Fed.Sec.L. Rep. (CCH) ¶ 94182, Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P94182, 1989 U.S.App. LEXIS 805 (6th Cir. 1989)*. The term “security”, within meaning of Securities Act, means investment in common enterprise in which investors are purchasing interest and where growth of that investment results from efforts of a promoter. *Neuwirth Inv. Fund, Ltd. v. Swanton, 422 F.Supp. 1187, 1975 U.S.Dist. LEXIS 15255 (D.N.Y. 1975)*. There IS no “promoter” in the case of Bitclub who could enlarge the value of physical computer hardware or in any way directly influence the economic value of property output of the physical computer hardware. Free market forces ONLY do that.
7. **Blows away the Howey test doesn’t it?!** The United States Supreme Court decision in *SEC v. W. J. Howey Co.*, 328 U.S. 293 (1946) says a court will look to “whether the scheme involves an investment of “**money**” in a common enterprise with profits to come solely from the efforts of others.” *Ibid.* at 301. There it is in black and white! Bitcoin isn’t money! **Your Honor, you must dismiss me from this case and tell the prosecutors to go after real criminals who actually harm people.**
8. And anyways, Title 15 (The Securities Act of 1933) wasn’t constitutionally enacted and isn’t even positive law per 1 U.S.C. §204 legislative notes. **There aren’t any corresponding regulations that implement it.** Even if Bitclub, as a nonresident foreign entity (PMA), was subject to Title 15 (1933 Securities Act), WHICH IT WAS NOT, violating it doesn’t create a victim anyway. If there is no victim or injured party, if there isn’t anyone with standing, then there is no “crime”. “Infractions” and “Code Violations” are not “crimes”. Title 15 is obviously unconstitutional because it violates our right to contract with each other. The Supreme court said that *“Any attempt to regulate exclusively private conduct of Americans is repugnant to the Constitution and therefore such conduct cannot lawfully become subject to any civil statutory law.”* *City of Boerne v. Flores Archbishop of San Antonio*, 521 U.S. 507 (1997). It’s impossible for a statute

**that violates the constitution to be valid.** That means Title 15 is a voluntary franchise that is avoidable. Filing a piece of paper with the SEC doesn't make the "investment" a good deal anyways. In fact, most all the Bitcoin mining companies that go the "publicly traded route" where they use dollars and sell shares (registered securities) instead of physical equipment, have lost their investors millions. MANY of them have gone out of business. Yet the SEC does nothing because they are "registered" securities? What a scam. Would you rather be a private member of a PMA like Bitclub that was successfully mining Bitcoin or be an "investor" in a "Publicly traded Bitcoin mining company" that sold you a security/stock and is now out of business, not mining Bitcoin, and you lost all your money? ... But at least it was registered don't ya know... So dumb.

9. If the regulators truly cared about investors, they would stop all the naked short selling, they wouldn't allow all the insider trading that Congress members get away with (investing in companies they regulate). They wouldn't allow all the fake paper gold and silver to be traded, metal that hasn't even been mined and doesn't even exist, just so the banks can artificially suppress the price, (Silver Spoofing derivatives they call it) so they can prop up their debt-based fiat dollars that are backed by nothing but "the full faith and credit" of the bankrupt government! They protect criminal activity. They don't care. Why continue to allow these obviously harmful and fraudulent things to happen? Hello?

The prosecution shouldn't spend millions of dollars trying to enforce unconstitutional statutes on private people. ***All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void, per Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803).*** Think about it, if a Chinese guy tells his Japanese friend that he should join Bitclub and get some equipment to hash to the mining pool, the SEC has no jurisdiction over that transaction. Those foreign private people didn't use dollars, they used Bitcoin to do the deal. **The SEC is overstepping its bounds and trying to claim jurisdiction it doesn't and shouldn't have.** Case Dismissed! In fact, the SEC (Duns & Bradstreet #003475175) is actually being used as a weapon by "status quo" companies to block competition (i.e., disruptive technologies) so they can have a monopoly and price gouge the people. Furthermore, the value of the computer hardware producing the information as property that I sold to Bitclub was more likely to go DOWN in value than UP. The equipment was subject to depreciation as new and better mining hardware becomes available. It's deceptive and fraudulent for the fictitious corporation known as the US Department of Justice (DOJ) (Duns & Bradstreet #011669674) to classify DEPRECIATING physical hardware as an "investment" or an "unregistered security". **The Chevron Deference case will reverse much of this non sense these 3 letter agencies are guilty of, praise God!** The Supreme Court is chomping at the bit to over rule you! I will bring this to the Supreme Court if you do not dismiss this case! I am your master and you are my servant. Know your place and dismiss this case!

#### **MORE REASONS WHY THE PLAINTIFF SHOULD NOT BE TRUSTED:**

In our Republic, we have a separation of power. Judge, is it not deceptive for politicians to call their spending of the

taxpayers' money an "investment," even when it is just pouring money down a bottomless pit, in order to win the votes of  
***Notice of Rescission of Plea Statement and Demand to Dismiss Petitioner from Case***

gullible people? The USA Inc. is \$35+ Trillion in “debt”, unfunded liabilities are at \$172 Trillion. This is madness! How is borrowing trillions of dollars from the Fed, (that they counterfeit from nothing) to then funnel billions of those taxpayer dollars to the “flavor of the week” Oligarchs of foreign countries, (i.e., foreign aid) so they can buy hundreds of millions of dollars worth of real estate for themselves and their friends around the world... How is that considered an “investment” and not money laundering? I’m sure you have read the Panama/Pandora/Paradise Papers, right? **How much of that “foreign aid” money comes back to fund political campaigns here at home?** We all know about the FTX money laundering fiasco, which cost investors tens of billions, was really just a democrat campaign slush fund created by crypto crooks to try and discredit Bitcoin and then set up a regulation monopoly while simultaneously rigging the mid-term elections for Democrats with stolen taxpayer funds... The only person who gave more money to Democrats than SBF (Sam Bankman-Fried who gave \$40m) in 2022 was George Soros! SBF STOLE \$10b with his FTX money laundering scam. (He did touch the US Financial system) When arrested, he put \$4m down on a \$250m bond? What? That’s 1.6%. No GPS monitoring. He can have computer and internet. No getting bounced around the country from jail to jail to jail for 11 months like me. I stole no money. I harmed no one and I broke no laws that I am subject to. Yet, I was denied a trial and only got bail once I “admitted” 2+2=5 and took a plea deal. I was forced to put up \$2m of \$2m bond. That’s 100% not 1.6%! I’ve been on GPS monitoring for over 4 years! I’m not allowed to have a phone or be on the internet etc. That seems fair... The plaintiff sent \$150,000,000,000+ of stolen taxpayer money to Ukraine this year... Solving homelessness costs \$4b a year. Amazing! Besides the \$600m that the plaintiff’s friend Zelensky pocketed to buy multi-million-dollar mansions around the world, Ukraine converted a bunch of that cash to crypto via FTX who funneled it to Democrat campaigns... Just ask Steve Ricchetti and Bruce Reed... This is illegal! **Yet the plaintiff claims the moral authority** to illegally try and regulate us private folks? **The Plaintiff/SEC can’t even successfully regulate actual companies that it has jurisdiction over, like FTX!** In fact, the SEC gave them a conditional no action relief so they could steal billions! And now the plaintiff has activated a new \$1.7 trillion dollar money laundering operation, funneling billions to Blackrock to “rebuild Ukraine” ... Now Goldman Sachs and Blackrock are some of the worlds biggest holders of Bitcoin! Boy things have changed since the persecutors illegally kidnapped and tortured me! It’s hard to imagine a more stupid or more dangerous way of making decisions than by putting those decisions in the hands of people who pay no price for being wrong. And yet, the prosecutors are going after someone like me who would never dream of doing anything like that to people?? Thats not fair or just!

Does getting us into a nuclear war with Russia (via Ukraine) and China (via Taiwan) to block the BRICS+ financial system from getting off the ground sound like a very good “investment” to you? War with Israel/Iran and over throwing Syria isn’t making Americans any safer... Isn’t “keeping us safe” the stated goal of the United Socialist States of America (USSA) comrade? Isn’t that the excuse used for robbing the American people blind to the tune of more than a trillion dollars a

year? For our protection and welfare? Tricking Americans into giving up Liberty for “safety/security”? Remember, “the welfare of humanity” has ALWAYS been the alibi of tyrants. This is why I embrace Bitcoin. Crypto doesn’t fund the welfare/warfare state. Dollars do. **Bitcoin is a private, morally superior alternative.** Think about it, terrorists and drug dealers (the plaintiff) use dollars to commit crimes far more than crypto according to a former CIA director. Obama, who won a Nobel Peace Prize, (while bombing 7 countries without a formal declaration of war by the Congress) didn’t send a billion + dollars’ worth of Bitcoin to Iran, (a state sponsor of terrorism) he flew them pallets full of cash. Then Biden sent them another \$6B! And a lot of that cash never made it to its “final destination”, as I’m sure the prosecutions “bosses” know... Cough, Northern Cyprus, cough cough...

Too many felonies that the plaintiff is involved in to list here. Just pointing out that you should not believe a thing the prosecution team tells you. Look, I went to the government BEFORE the defective indictment took place and offered to help them catch hackers and other bad actors in the crypto space who steal from people, creating victims, which gives Bitcoin a bad reputation. Instead of the FBI/CIA having me on their team to actually help them catch bad guys, they kidnap, extort and torture me and treat me like I'm the bad guy, even though I harmed no one! Look, I just want to be left alone. The society most Americans live in is insane. They have to be insane to be able to operate comfortably in that reality. Or maybe its the other way around and I'm the insane one who thinks, slavery, torture, mass murder and genocide is wrong? Shall I claim insanity as another reason for you to dismiss this case and have the government leave me alone? If wanting to create a peaceful, abundant and prosperous world for everyone is an insane idea, then I guess I'm crazy! There are two choices, I'm either sane and the plaintiff is insane or the plaintiff is sane and I'm insane. When are we going to start sending the leaders of the United States to jail or mental institutions for these crimes they are committing?

When US CITIZENS pay their taxes, they are literally funding terrorists to commit acts of terrorism. If the plaintiff feels the need to murder millions of gullible people around the world to “save the environment” or whatever, fine, I can’t stop them, they have an army of prosecutors to protect them from being brought to justice. At least I'm on the record opposing the genocide the psychopathic plaintiff is rolling out around the world. Meanwhile, Sam Bankman-Fried admits on TV to robbing 5 million people so he can fund the persecutors criminal bosses’ campaigns, and he's getting puff pieces in the New York Times while Daniel Hale, who leaked the “Drone Papers”, is suffering in a dungeon for the "crime of committing the TRUTH" by revealing that 9 out of 10 people the Plaintiff murders with drone strikes are mere bystanders. The USSA/Plaintiff is guilty of multiple war crimes and terrorism on a global scale... Yet the prosecutors want to stick a gun to my head and force me to fund this!? Jesus said it best! *“You hypocrites! How about you pull the plank out of your own eye before looking for specs in mine.”* Matt 7:1-6 Justice really is “blind”, isn’t it? I want nothing to do with this evil the plaintiff is perpetrating. I’ve given my life and all my possessions to God. It’s against my religion and trust indenture with God to fund mass murder and genocide so stop trying to steal God’s money to pay for it. You shouldn't have dragged

me into this. When God is for me, who can be against me? Romans 8:31. The prosecutors work for occult “secret society” masonic mass murderers (the plaintiff) and do nothing about their crimes. (Other than covering them up and then coming after people like me who have harmed no one and want no part in their genocidal agenda being played out right now by the plaintiff.)

— President John F. Kennedy said, “*The very word "secrecy" is repugnant in a free and open society; and we are as a people inherently and historically opposed to secret societies, to secret oaths and to secret proceedings...Our way of life is under attack. Those who make themselves our enemy are advancing around the globe...no war ever posed a greater threat to our security. If you are awaiting a finding of "clear and present danger;" then I can only say that the danger has never been clearer and its presence has never been more imminent... For we are opposed around the world by a monolithic and ruthless conspiracy that relies primarily on covert means for expanding its sphere of influence—on infiltration instead of invasion, on subversion instead of elections, on intimidation instead of free choice, on guerrillas by night instead of armies by day. It is a system which has conscripted vast human and material resources into the building of a tightly knit, highly efficient machine that combines military, diplomatic, intelligence, economic, scientific and political operations. Its preparations are concealed, not published. Its mistakes are buried, not headlined. Its dissenters are silenced, not praised. No expenditure is questioned, no rumor is printed, no secret is revealed.*”

Ephesians 6:12 “*For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places*”. Truth!

Speaking of mass murdering terrorists, (the plaintiff) which currency do you think the prosecutors use? They use the gangster bankster legal tender scrip that their terrorist bosses create out of nothing, don’t they? And that, my friends, is why the FEDERAL RESERVE (Duns & Bradstreet #001959410), via their pawns in the persecutors office, are cracking down on their crypto competition here at home by kidnapping and torturing peace loving victims like me, who have harmed no one, and going to war, (i.e. committing mass murder) to protect the dollar hegemony, with nation states abroad. Being able to create money out of nothing and then forcing other countries from around the world, at the barrel of a gun, to accept it for their goods and services, is what this is all about. It’s theft and fraud to the tune of trillions. That is who the prosecutors work for. They use the currency of economic terrorists and protect their interests to their own detriment, don’t they? Just wait until the Central Bank Digital Currencies are forced upon us... To the jury who may read this one day, do you really want these criminals to control every aspect of your life? Isaiah 1:23 “*Your rulers are rebels and companions of thieves. Everyone loves a bribe and chases after rewards...*” It’s amazing anyone would believe a word the prosecutors/plaintiffs say. I want nothing to do with this violence and madness that they are committing. They have zero credibility, yet here I am, having to defend myself because in todays “USSA” you’re guilty until proven innocent, strip searched and

molested, and they throw you in a cage BEFORE they convict you of a crime and then torture you until you "admit" that  $2+2=5$  and take a plea deal. Shame on all of those involved. You must dismiss me from this case!

10. The physical computer hardware being PURCHASED and not "INVESTED" in, either produced the information output as property or it didn't. The member trading Bitcoin for the hardware had evidence of its ability to do so before acquiring the hardware. There were no "misrepresentations" about the computing ability of said hardware made to anyone acquiring said hardware. **No profits or Return on Investment (ROI) were promised by Bitclub or me especially and the defective indictment never alleged that there was.** It's impossible to promise an ROI because the value of bitcoin and the difficulty to mine a Bitcoin changes every second of the day! I said this to people at least 100 times when asked.
11. If anything, Bitclub was closer to a computer timeshare hosting organization than a Wall Street securities firm. However, it wasn't a company... If you want to call computer hosting a "security", then Microsoft, Google, Amazon, who all offer hosting, also need to register all their physical servers as securities as well? Do you plan on prosecuting them also, and if not, then is the prosecution team not engaging in unjust, discriminatory "selective enforcement" for personal gain in violation of 18 U.S.C. §208 (conflict of interest)? Remember, Bitclub was a Private Membership Association (PMA) outside the jurisdiction of the SEC that regulated its own legal affairs internally without the need to involve corrupt prosecutors who fund their activities with stolen "protection money" (taxes/asset forfeiture) like the mafia.
12. Lastly, those purchasing the hardware could request physical delivery of their mining hardware if they wanted to mine from home. In fact, **Bitclub did send members their mining hardware when the member requested them to do so.**

### 3.4. Exculpatory Tax Returns in Re. 26 U.S.C. §7201 Government Fabricated Guilty Plea

1. Facts in reference to tax charges:
  - A. In Docket 148, the "Petitioner" illegally plead guilty, under duress, to one count of 26 U.S.C. §7201: Attempt to evade or defeat tax. *"The term "person" as used in this chapter, includes an officer or employee of a corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership, who as such officer, employee, or member is under a duty to perform the act in respect of which the violation occurs."* Again, **thats not me. I am a living man part of "the people."** I am not a "person" as defined in your code.
  - B. The original defective indictment contained no tax charges, so this plea was beyond the scope of the initial action and therefore void. And, if you think about it, the government wants the world to believe that the "artificial person" JOBADIAH WEEKS is guilty of tax fraud. Lying on your tax returns would be considered fraud, right? However, I wasn't required to file tax returns on behalf of that entity to begin with because I'm not an officer of that office or trustee of that trust and thus no forms were filed. (Failing to file a 1040 is a misdemeanor, not fraud) **How could I have lied or committed fraud if I have said or filed nothing? Its impossible!** Failing to file forms, that you don't

have to file in the first place, isn't fraud. Those who call it fraud are... well... committing fraud by lying and slandering me aren't they?

- C. However to prove that I was NOT willfully or knowingly engaged in tax "crimes", I subsequently submitted exculpatory tax returns for the affected years within the six year statute of limitation found at 26 U.S.C. §6531 once I was on supervised release. See the exhibits.
- 2. I spoke with a tax attorney and he told me that I should file a tax return for the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (TRUST) even though I am NOT the consensual trustee, to get the IRS off my back. In fact, ALL of my now fired attorneys suggested that I should engage in a criminal conspiracy with them in violation of 18 U.S.C. §371. (This is the same CRIME that the trust/office is already being accused of and that my X lawyers are supposed to be defending it from!) They wanted me to commit the crimes documented below by filing the WRONG income tax form, the IRS Form 1040. Therefore, I had to fire them all in my previous motion. I don't want to break the law! Below is exhaustive proof for the record of the laws I would be breaking if I took their advice:

*Why It's a Crime for a Private state national to File a 1040 Income Tax Return*, Form #08.021

<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/WhyCrimefileReturn.pdf> Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

- 3. I did file tax returns after being released to avoid violating the terms of my release, even though by doing so, as my attorneys wanted me to do, is CLEARLY criminal with the Form 1040 as explained above. **Instead, I filed the IRS Form 1040NR return**, and even a tax liability on that form is voluntary, as exhaustively described in the following:

*How State Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax*, Form #08.024

<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf> Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

Remember, The states of the union are legislatively foreign to each other. Foreign DOMICILE, not foreign NATIONALITY, is what makes **people** in the states legislatively foreign to each other. They are DOMESTIC in a constitutional sense, but FOREIGN in a LEGISLATIVE sense. That makes Americans living in one of the states of the union "foreigners" civilly and statutorily with regards to the "Federal Zone United States" and the NATIONAL government. Their estate and income is actually defined as a "Foreign Estate" in the code under 26 U.S.C. 7701 (a) (31) "*The term "foreign estate" means an estate the income of which from sources without the United States which is NOT effectively connected with the conduct of a "trade or business" within the United States, is not includible in gross income under subtitle A".*

In Moore vs USA (2024) a recent US Supreme Court decision, in which the Court explains which Americans should NOT pay income taxes! The Court also spanked half the US Circuit Courts of Appeal, who have been 100% wrong for almost 100 years, in the process! The income tax is an indirect tax! Like all indirect taxes, **that means that it is avoidable** by declining to

participate in a privileged taxable activity! The exercise of a privilege (trade of business... i.e. functions of a public office) is what's being taxed, not the income! Step 1, don't become a public officer! The damage those circuit courts have done over the years by calling it a direct tax is unfathomable! A truly phenomenal decision!

(a) Article I of the Constitution affords Congress broad power to lay and collect taxes. That power includes direct taxes—those imposed on persons or property—and indirect taxes—those imposed on activities or transactions. Direct taxes must be apportioned among the States according to each State's population, while indirect taxes are permitted without apportionment but must "be uniform throughout the United States," §8, cl. 1. Taxes on income are indirect taxes, and the Sixteenth Amendment confirms that taxes on income need not be apportioned. Pp. 5–7.

4. It is my expectation that these returns are so damning to the plaintiff/government's case that the IRS may never process them, even though they are entirely consistent with the law and the circumstances of me the Petitioner. So, I thought I'd put them in the exhibits here as well to get them on the record to prove my innocence and my scrupulous desire to learn and obey all laws that I am demonstrably subject to.
5. And, as I'm sure you know, just like Title 15, Title 26 isn't even positive law either per 1 U.S.C. §204 legislative notes. Out of the 250,000 pages of the statutes at large, Titles 1-54, how many of those titles are positive law? According to US Gov. Printing Office: "*Of the 54 titles, only 26 have been enacted into positive (statutory) law. These titles are 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, 28, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 46, 49, 51 and 54. When a title of the Code is enacted into positive law, the text of the title becomes legal evidence of the law. Titles that have NOT been enacted into positive law are only *prima facie* evidence of the law.*" <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscode>

I don't see Title 15 or 26 on that list above, do you? Those missing 28 Statutes/Titles (including Title 15 and 26) have no "implementing regulations" for "enforcement provisions". Without such enforcement regulations the provisions cited in non-positive law statutes can and do apply only to government/plaintiff's statutory officers/employees to include:

- 1) A military or foreign affairs function of the United States. 5 U.S.C. 553 (a) (1)
- 2) A matter relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts. 5 U.S.C. 553 (a) (2)
- 3) AND Federal agencies or persons in the capacity as officers, agents or employees thereof. In 44 U.S.C. 1505 (a) (1)

**Well, I'm not any of those things which is why I must be dismissed from this case!**

## Title 18 shenanigans!

To add insult to injury, **and this is important for not only this case, but the millions of other people currently locked up in this country**, when the law ostensibly re-codifying title 18, Public Law 80-772, HR 3190 (June 25<sup>th</sup> 1948) came into being, its passage involved three distinct procedural errors. The first was that it violated the bicameral requirement of the U.S.

Constitution. (The Presentment Clause, Art. I, § 7, cl. 2) See, Clinton vs. City of New York, 524 U.S. 417 (1998) **The bills from the house and senate need to be identical**. The House version of the bill, rejected by the Senate, was mistakenly certified as "truly enrolled," instead of the amended version, rendering a second procedural error, because with the rejected version being certified as "truly enrolled," it left the seal on a document which was abandoned and with it, any protections afforded by the "Enrolled Bill Rule," not to mention the uncertified amended version presented as genuine legislation. Third, WHEN the House sought to pass the Senate's amended version, it did NOT have a quorum. To remedy the shortfall so as to not violate the quorum clause, it passed H.R. 219, which supposedly permitted them to conduct business, such as the passage of a Senate's amended version of a prior legislated bill, without the constitutionally required quorum. However, H.R. 219 was NOT passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, as required, since it proposed substantive changes in constitutionally mandated procedure, thus **H.R. 219 was in and of itself unconstitutional**, as was the subsequent passage of the amended Senate version, shepherded by an unconstitutional House resolution. **Thus, these statutes that the "res" is being charged with do not exist as valid statutes to begin with!** The district court has no subject matter jurisdiction over the alleged acts covered thereby. The only statute which gives the court jurisdiction to indict and convict on any crime is TITLE 18, listed in the March 4, 1909 Act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States. see: SIXTIETH CONGRESS. Sess. II. CHs. 320, 321. – 1909. This makes 18 USC section 3231 invalid, see Bond v. United States; No. 09-1227 (2011). The federal Title 18 criminal code was codified in 1909, again in 1940, and again in 1948. In 1909 and 1940 the jurisdictional section for federal courts only authorized prosecution under TITLE 18 crimes, not SEC or IRS crimes. Those "crimes" didn't exist in 1909! To say it another way, the defective indictment doesn't charge a valid federal crime!!! Therefore, the indictment is void and without legal affect. Thus, Public Law 80-772 must be declared unconstitutional, and remedied. In its wake, **the false indictment and phony conviction is void and must be vacated per Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 60 (b) (4) (judgement is void)**. Even though the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is considered "maladministration" when dealing with due process violations. Think of all the millions of people who have been wrongfully prosecuted by the federal government since 1948! Imagine all the families that the plaintiff has destroyed over the past 70 years, illegally enforcing all these victimless "crimes" that aren't even positive law "crimes" to begin with! It's mind blowing! Positive law rebuts non positive law! Now some judges/lawyers might think that following the procedures for making law, laid out in the Constitution, is dumb or not necessary and those who blow the whistle on the procedural errors are labeled "frivolous". However, calling people names doesn't change the fact that everything stated above is true and if the court doesn't

do their job, declaring it void, like they have 100's of times in the past, then they are guilty of a misprision of a felony and accessories to the crime after the fact. Why not follow the law and procedures correctly? Why is that so hard?

(see: <https://law.justia.com/constitution/us/acts-of-congress-held-unconstitutional.html>)

Think about it, there are 7 billion people on earth. If you asked them all what the capital of New York is, I bet 6 billion people would say New York City... Now, that doesn't change the fact that Albany is the actual capital of NY... Saying Albany is the capital of NY is NOT frivolous even though 6 billion people would disagree with you! Stop what you are doing and re-read what I just wrote. **Let what you just read sink in... Think of the millions of lives that have been destroyed because of this fraud that I just pointed out to you. Will you do something about it to make it stop?**

While speaking with my whistle blower Ex-IRS special agent friend, **Joe Banister**, whom I mentioned to the prosecutors, he told me that, "*There is no law that requires the average American worker in the private sector to pay a direct, unapportioned tax on their labor and compensation.*" I thought wow, this coming from an IRS special agent, but then I did some research and found out that my IRS special agent friend was indeed correct! Title 26 is a voluntary CIVIL franchise that is avoidable, like the IRS commissioners and agents have been saying for years. See the following admission by the IRS Commissioner during a congressional hearing admitting the same: *Former IRS Commissioner Steven Miller and Congressman Beccera both admit that the income tax is "voluntary";* <http://youtu.be/MG2mcjAuLo4> .

7. Remember, forcing private people, protected by the Bill of Rights, living in a parallel “sand box”, who are not subject to civil statutory codes, to file a tax return that only government officers are required to file, is wrong. The plaintiff should stop trying to enforce unconstitutional statutes on innocent private Americans who live and work outside of the “Fed Zone” “UNITED STATES” the federal corporation (i.e. USA Inc.) described in 28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A). It’s illegal and immoral for them to continue do so, especially now that they know! Remember, the “end of Justice” is to be left alone, not continue frivolous cases for years and years and years! Having another 80,000 ignorant, compartmentalized IRS gang members with guns using force, fraud and coercion to steal money is immoral and illegitimate. Do the prosecutors and agents reading this have the courage and conviction, like my IRS special agent friend, to follow the constitution, blow the whistle and go after your bosses who lied to you? Would sure be nice if you did! Something tells me, you love money more than doing what’s right. Look, I just want to be left alone to take complete and exclusive responsibility for myself and do my peaceful and honest work helping others. It costs you nothing to leave me alone so you can’t try and charge or tax me for it. Only the mafia does that... And the IRS (**Duns & Bradstreet #040539587**) is certainly not the mafia, right? Of course it’s a legitimate organ of the national government even though there is NO authority within Title 31 for it to even exist with the Department of the Treasury... Right? Even though it allegedly works for the Secretary of the Treasury... I wonder WHICH treasury? The one in Puerto Rico? See why so many IRS agents, like Joe Banister, Shelia Jackson and John Turner are quitting the scam and leaving the conspiracy once they discover the truth below:

*The Great IRS Hoax*, Form #11.302;

<https://famguardian.org/Publications/GreatIRSHoax/GreatIRSHoax.htm>

*“Those who can make you believe absurdities; can make you commit atrocities.”*

[Voltaire; <https://succeedfeed.com/voltaire-quotes/>]

#### **4. WRIT OF QUO WARRANTO AGAINST THE UNLAWFULLY CREATED RES/CIVIL STATUS WHO IS THE TARGET OF THIS ENFORCEMENT ACTION**

1. Petitioner plead guilty under duress to one count each of 26 U.S.C. §7201 and 15 U.S.C. §§77e and 77x. These offenses had two predicate civil statuses of “person” found in 26 U.S.C. §7343 and 15 U.S.C. §77b(a)(2) respectively. If you read those definitions of “person” in title 26 and title 15 you will see that I am NOT a “person” as defined in the code.
2. Those two civil statutory “persons” are creations of, offices of, and property of the national government grantor. The property these two offices oversee are the rights and obligations attached to said civil statuses. Rights and obligations are property. *“Public Office. [ . . . ] Where, by virtue of law, a person is clothed, not as an incidental or transient authority, but for such time as de-notes duration and continuance, with independent power to control the property of the public”* [Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1235]. Any officers serving in said offices must be volunteers and KNOWINGLY volunteer, or else involuntary servitude is the result.

*“. . . Waivers of constitutional rights not only must be voluntary, but must be knowing, intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and likely consequences. . . ”*

*[Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742, 748]*

3. Just like The United States Federal Corporation (USA Inc.), I (“the People”) as the origin of their authority delegated by the Constitution have a right to prescribe the manner and conditions in which my consent is manifested. In my case, that consent can only be manifested in a writing signed by BOTH parties, under circumstances in which I may not be penalized in any way for NOT consenting. No government form satisfies this method of giving consent because such forms are never signed by the government after they receive it. Therefore, consent is impossible in relation to all governments.

*“Every man is supposed to know the law. A party who makes a contract with an officer without having it reduced to writing is knowingly accessory to a violation of duty on his part. Such a party aids in the violation of the law. We are of opinion, therefore, that the contract itself is affected, and must conform to the requirements of the statute until it passes from the observation and control of the party who enters into it. After that, if the officer fails to follow the further directions of the act with regard to affixing his affidavit and returning a copy of the contract to the proper office, the party is not responsible for this neglect.”*

*[Clark v. United States, 95 U.S. 539 (1877)]*

4. Consistent with the above manner of giving my consent, Petitioner hereby certifies under penalty of perjury that he never volunteered for any civil office in the national government which could give rise to any such obligations, and that it is beyond his delegation of authority order, the Holy Bible, to consent to such duties as a full time officer of the Kingdom of Heaven 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. I don't work for the devil! I work for God!
5. As such, the two civil statutory offices, who is the fictional "defendant", were never lawfully created and any attempt to impute or enforce their duties against me as an innocent bystander represents criminal identity theft and false personation in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §912 and a violation of the very principles of justice itself, which is the right to be LET ALONE and not harassed, and especially not by those who claim to want to IMPLEMENT justice at the Department of InJustice when in reality they don't... Prove me wrong and dismiss this case!
6. The PROSECUTION alleges/presumes in the defective indictment that I occupy these two offices, because the crimes to which I plead guilty under unlawful duress have these offices as predicate civil statuses. The prosecution, as moving party, therefore has the burden of proving that these offices are lawfully occupied, that I LAWFULLY consented to occupy them, and that I had the CAPACITY to consent within the confines of 4 U.S.C. §72. Pleading guilty to a crime of exercising an office improperly, that I not only don't occupy, and CAN'T lawfully occupy, is an absurdity, which is why I had to withdraw my extorted plea in this filing to begin with. In fact, I can't even "ask" the court, because asking is sanctioning the court to break the law. I'm putting the court "on notice" that the plea has been withdrawn, NOT from "guilty" to "not guilty", because a "not guilty" plea still gives the court jurisdiction in this matter. The court does NOT have jurisdiction over me a living man because I am NOT a voluntary surety for this constructive, fraudulent trust/public office.  
 Beneficiaries can't make a plea one way or the other for a trust. **Only the trustee, which is the judge, can do that!** These civil statutes are "club rules" or "corporate by laws" for members/citizens/residents/officers/trustees/franchisees. AND I am NOT a member of your club or an employee of your corporation, and I would never knowingly consent to become one! It's against my biblical delegation of authority order to become a member of your club! No man can serve two masters! I serve God, not the devil. See: [Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians. https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/DelOfAuthority.pdf](https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/DelOfAuthority.pdf) Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.
7. The burden of proof therefore rests upon the Prosecution, as a Writ of Quo Warranto under the common law and NOT the civil statutory franchise codes of their club, to prove the following in order to lawfully maintain the existence of these offices THEY CREATED through nothing but a mere PRESUMPTION, and in violation of due process of law:
  - A. That the two civil offices of "person" described in 26 U.S.C. §7343 and 15 U.S.C. §77b(a)(2) may NOT lawfully be exercised extraterritorially within a constitutional state or abroad without express statutory extraterritorial authorization by Congress, as required by 4 U.S.C. §72. Petitioner can find NO such express authorization and therefore, it must be presumed to NOT exist.

- B. That the Petitioner expressly consented to these two civil offices. All just powers derive from CONSENT of those governed by the civil statutory law, according to the Declaration of Independence, which is organic law. Anything not PROVEN to be consensual is therefore inherently UNJUST.
- C. That it is even POSSIBLE to exercise “the functions of a public office” without even knowing it or how one became such public officer.
- D. That the Petitioner, as a full-time fiduciary has the lawful delegated authority to consent to said offices without violating his biblical delegation of authority order and SEDM’s membership agreement. “No man can serve two masters” is what my King told me on this subject in Matt. 6:24, through one of his FORMER tax collectors who quit his job in disgust when he found out he was a useful idiot for tyrants. Just like the prosecutors in this case!
- E. That absent consent, the Prosecution is NOT violating the Thirteenth Amendment prohibition against involuntary servitude in the case of the Petitioner as a man and not a fiction standing on land protected by the Constitution.
- F. The oath and appointment document making the Petition into the LAWFULLY SERVING public officer who has such duties, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §3331. Without such a LAWFUL oath or appointment document, the office is de facto and void.
- G. Evidence that absent the existence of such a voluntarily and LAWFULLY occupied civil statutory offices, that extraterritorial application of Title 26 and Title 15 is lawful among those acting in a private, constitutionally protected capacity without violating the First Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, and the Thirteenth Amendment.
- H. Evidence that any man or woman can UNILATERALLY “elect” themselves into a civil statutory office of any kind with their consent and without a lawful appointment or election. Petitioner can find NO EVIDENCE in Title 5 of the U.S. Code authorizing such an act and therefore, per the rules of statutory construction, the ability to do so is purposefully excluded:

*“It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term. Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979). Congress’ use of the term “propaganda” in this statute, as indeed in other legislation, has no pejorative connotation. {19} As judges, it is our duty to [481 U.S. 485] construe legislation as it is written, not as it might be read by a layman, or as it might be understood by someone who has not even read it.”*

*[Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484 (1987)]*

*“Expressio unius est exclusio alterius. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another. Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325; Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d 1097, 1100. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. When certain persons or things are specified in a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be inferred. Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are excluded.”*

*[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581]*

*"When a statute includes an explicit definition, we must follow that definition, even if it varies from that term's ordinary meaning. Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987) ("It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term"); Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10 ("As a rule, 'a definition which declares what a term "means" . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated'"); Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945); Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935) (Cardozo, J.); see also 2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992) (collecting cases). That is to say, the statute, read "as a whole," post at 998 [530 U.S. 943] (THOMAS, J., dissenting), leads the reader to a definition. That definition does not include the Attorney General's restriction -- "the child up to the head." Its words, "substantial portion," indicate the contrary."*

*[Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)]*

- I. How it is that third parties filing false information returns, such as the IRS Forms 1099, W-2, and 1042-S without the consent of the subject of the returns, can unilaterally "elect" anyone into a public office through such reports without their consent, and sometimes even their knowledge??? It can't! So stop pretending it can! 26 U.S.C. §6041(a) mandates that such information returns may only lawfully be filed in the case of a statutory "trade or business", which is defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) as "the functions of a public office". Certainly, one cannot exercise the FUNCTIONS of such an office without BEING lawfully elected or appointed to public office under the provisions of Title 5 with a lawful election or appointment and oath in the first place! **See and rebut the following on the record if the Prosecution disagrees or be held to agree:** *Correcting Erroneous Information Returns*, Form #05.001;

<https://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/0-CorrErrInfoRtns/CorrErrInfoRtns.pdf>. To the prosecution, you have 30 days.

8. Petitioner emphasizes that absent satisfaction of the above burden of proof on the record of these proceedings WITH supporting evidence by the Prosecution, this frivolous proceeding becomes a fraud upon the court and the Prosecutor is engaging in a conspiracy in violation of 18 U.S.C. §371 with the judge to compel me to bribe them with my money and services in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §201 to treat me AS IF I am the civil statutory office of "person" in the context of these proceedings. It is my duty to speak the truth of this matter on the record or else in the future, to become a criminal accessory after the fact to it, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §3. Aren't we supposed to leave a criminal conspiracy once we discover it? Will the prosecution leave the conspiracy now that they have mens rae (knowledge of the crime)?
9. I also emphasize that both the Prosecution and the Court cannot remain silent when confronted with the possibility of a crime and as party to it, without being guilty of **criminal misprision of felony** in violation of 18 U.S.C. §4.
10. Silence or omission in dealing with this common law Quo Warranto Action shall therefore serve as:
  - A. Indicia that the Prosecution and possibly the judge is acting with a financial conflict of interest in violation of 18 U.S.C. §208, 28 U.S.C. §144, and 28 U.S.C. §455 and must recuse themselves.
  - B. An admission that the Prosecution is engaging in a criminal conspiracy with the judge of the following crimes: 18 U.S.C. §912, 18 U.S.C. §201, 18 U.S.C. §208, 18 U.S.C. §371, 18 U.S.C. §3, 18 U.S.C. §4, and likely several others.

11. Lastly, the Petitioner emphasizes that this is a **COMMON LAW** action, and not a civil statutory action. **Nonresident aliens such as Petitioner cannot invoke civil statutory protections or have civil statutory obligations or privileges.** For the Prosecution or the Court to invoke civil statutes to interfere with such an action, such as those found in 28 U.S.C. §2201 would also constitute criminal identity theft and compel the surrender of ALL constitutional rights by the Petitioner in the process, per the **Brandeis Rules**. That too would be involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment. Petitioner ESCHEWS ANY AND ALL “benefits” of civil statutory protections at all times, consistent with his biblical delegation of authority order as a full-time Trustee/Fiduciary of Yah, our creator. The only thing such statutes protect is a criminal mafia, and never ME personally anyway:

*“The Court developed, for its own governance in the cases confessedly within its jurisdiction, a series of rules under which it has avoided passing upon a large part of all the constitutional questions pressed upon it for decision. They are:*

[...]

The Court will not pass upon the constitutionality of a statute at the instance of one who has availed himself of its benefits. FN7 Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General, 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527; Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U.S. 407, 411, 412, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229; St. Louis Malleable Casting Co. v. Prendergast Construction Co., 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351.

FOOTNOTES:

FN7 Compare *Electric Co. v. Dow*, 166 U.S. 489, 17 S.Ct. 645, 41 L.Ed. 1088; *Pierce v. Somerset Ry.*, 171 U.S. 641, 648, 19 S.Ct. 64, 43 L.Ed. 316; *Leonard v. Vicksburg, etc., R. Co.*, 198 U.S. 416, 422, 25 S.Ct. 750, 49 L.Ed. 1108.

[*Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936)]

## 5. SECOND CLARIFICATION OF WORD “DEFENDANT”

1. There are THREE parties to this proceeding:
2. The “Defendant”, i.e. JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, aka, MR. WEEKS, aka, SIR, etc. (i.e., The Res or Thing) which is a commercial vessel. It’s an “office/trust” within the national government that is domiciled on federal territory as required by 4 U.S.C. §72 and satisfies one or more of the following:
  - A. Is engaged in national franchises such as the “trade or business” excise taxable franchise within U.S. Code Title 26 and defined at 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26). Property under government control in this case is the office, which is a creation of and absolutely owned property of United States Inc. per 28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A). . . OR
  - B. Is in possession, use, benefit, or custody of property owned by the national government and thereby subject to direct legislative jurisdiction of the national government under Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, 5 U.S.C. §553(a)(2), and 44 U.S.C. §1505(a).

3. The second party is Jobadiah-Sinclair: of the family Weeks, (Joby) a living man, above the age of majority, without the disability of minority, a non-resident alien, a 15+ year perpetual traveler, whose domicile is the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth, and who was made, without his knowledge or consent, a compelled surety for the office of "Defendant".

*SURETY. One who undertakes to pay money or to do any other act in event that his principal fails therein. In re Brock, 312 Pa. 92, 166 A. 778, 781. One bound with his principal for the payment of a sum of money or for the performance of some duty or promise and who is entitled to be indemnified by someone who ought to have paid or performed if payment or performance be enforced against him. Anderson v. Trueman, 100 Fla. 727, 130 So. 12, 13. Everyone who incurs a liability in person or estate, for the benefit of another, without sharing in the consideration, stands in the position of a "surety," whatever may be the form of his obligation. Howell v. War Finance Corporation, C.C.A.Ariz., 71 F.2d 237, 243.*

[Black's Law Dictionary, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition]

4. The third party is the Government and their officers, which includes, the prosecution team, the judge and, unbelievably, the accused ex lawyers too. So, in reality, most cases are 3 against 1... That doesn't seem fair, yet here is the truth.

5. In 7 Corpus Juris Secundum Legal Encyclopedia (C.J.S.) Attorney & Client, § 4. Defines the Attorney & Client Relationship. All attorneys are officers of the court. As an officer of the court, "His first duty is to the courts and the public, not to the client".

6. I was under the impression that my ex attorneys represented and worked to defend me first and foremost, not the court. I am NOT a "ward of the court". I'm a free, living man. One can only represent a "thing". Things are defined in Black's Law Dictionary as "The objects of dominion or property... the object of a right". Really? Is this what attorneys really think of their clients? That we are just "things" and not people? Or do they know that "the res" (civil statutory status) is a thing/office? And if so, are they not a party to this fraud? Today I'm setting the record straight and declare that I am not your thing or your property, or a ward of any court. I'm a free man and I stand in Yah, the creators Kingdom under an express biblical Trust covenant with him.

7. Explanation of the thing, the res, the public office or government agent:

A. A "public office" is legally defined as someone in charge of the property of the public for a fixed time:

*"Public office. The right, authority, and duty created and conferred by law, by which for a given period, either fixed by law or enduring at the pleasure of the creating power, an individual is invested with some portion of the sovereign functions of government for the benefit of the public. Walker v. Rich, 79 Cal.App. 139, 249 P. 56, 58. An agency for the state, the duties of which involve in their performance the exercise of some portion of the sovereign power, either great or small. Yaselli v. Goff, C.C.A., 12 F.2d. 396, 403, 56 A.L.R. 1239; Lacey v. State, 13 Ala.App. 212, 68 So. 706, 710; Curtin v. State, 61 Cal.App. 377, 214 P. 1030, 1035; Shelmadine v. City of Elkhart, 75 Ind.App. 493, 129 N.E. 878. State ex rel. Colorado River Commission v. Frohmiller, 46 Ariz. 413, 52 P.2d. 483, 486. Where, by virtue of [civil statutory] law, a [civil statutory] person is clothed, not as an incidental or transient authority, but for such time as de-notes duration and continuance, with Independent power to control the property of the public, or with public functions to be exercised in the supposed interest of the people, the service to be compensated by a stated yearly salary, and the occupant having a designation or title, the position so created is a public office. State v. Brennan, 49 Ohio.St. 33, 29 N.E. 593. [Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1235]*

B. There is no constitutional authority to use gifts or grants of public property within Constitutional states of the Union to CREATE new public offices or appoint new public officers, and especially not for income taxation purposes. That would violate the separation of powers.

*"Congress cannot authorize a trade or business [public office franchise] within a State in order to tax it."*

*[License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)]*

C. 4 U.S.C. §72 mandates that ALL public offices (including the “**trade or business**” excise taxable franchises (under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)) of the national government, shall be exercised in the District of Columbia except as EXPRESSLY PROVIDED BY LAW.

D. Congress has never “expressly authorized” new public offices outside of the geographical District of Columbia for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code, or U.S. Code Title 18 because that would be illegal. Therefore, all those serving outside the District of Columbia are “de facto” officers unauthorized to serve. This INCLUDES the office of “Defendant” in this case, who resigned as said officer/trustee decades ago. Is that why the trust/res (civil statutory status such as “person”) has to get licenses to do anything and everything? Has the bankrupt de facto corporation masquerading as a government not tricked most Americans to unknowingly convert their natural rights into privileges that they need to get a license for? You bet! The Res (the collection of rights and obligations as property that attach to the civil statutory status) needs a license to hunt, fish, cut hair, practice medicine and law, get married, build a home and drive a car... Remember, licenses are required to do something that would otherwise be illegal... Since when is it illegal to get married or travel in a private automobile? If it isn’t, why the “need” for a marriage or driver’s license? There isn’t one! Living and breathing men and women don’t need to get licenses to exercise their rights. In *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105 “**No State shall convert a Liberty into a license, and charge a fee therefore.**” “If a State converts a right (Liberty) into a privilege, the citizen can ignore the license and fee and engage in the right (liberty) with impunity.” *Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham Alabama*, 373 U.S. 262.

Are you starting to see the wool that’s been pulled over their eyes. If only the sadistic compartmentalized agents of the matrix (the plaintiff) could also see and obey the Constitution themselves! In fact, this is what “The Matrix” Movie was all about. They are “Agent Smith” and I am Neo. Everyone always cheers for Neo! How anyone could actually go and voluntarily apply to become “Agent Smith” is beyond me.

For proof, see:

*Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union*, Form #05.052

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf> Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

8. The JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS TRUST, (i.e., The Res/cardholder) is the property of the government. The Social Security Card is the initial corpus of that trust, and NOT the numeric value on it, per 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d). Like I mentioned earlier, I resigned from the de facto trustee “public office” position long ago and sent the physical property back to the government. I have court admissible evidence that they have received it. **Suffice it to say, the plaintiff has never rebutted the correspondence that they have received from me which means they agree with my status above, which makes it unlawful for them to make me the target of any civil or criminal tax enforcement.** The plaintiff is estopped from changing their position, as they are trying to do now, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6).
9. Again, the trust was abandoned years ago. If you’re going to litigate against a trust, you need to go after the trustee/fiduciary, which is YOU not me!

## **6. SECOND NOTICE OF SERVICE MARK INFRINGEMENT**

1. Court is noticed that a service mark owned by me, the man, Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks with the name “JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS” is on file with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO #97537251) prohibiting commercial use of the all caps artificial person’s name for the “benefit” of anyone other than Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks. (me)
2. Here is proof that the government has been making a fortune by issuing and trading bonds on my intellectual property, birth certificate and even this court case. See Cusip numbers below.

Your CUSIP Results are as follows:

Your CUSIP Results are as follows:

**JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (BC 105-81-030355)**  
**Fidelity Government Income Fund**  
Symbol: FVIAX  
CUSIP: **31617K782**  
Inception Date: 10/24/2006  
Net Assets: \$3,449,859,000.00 as of 10/18/2022  
Portfolio Assets: \$3,449,859,000.00 as of 10/18/2022

**JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (CC 19-CR-877-NJ-CECCHI)**  
**Fidelity Asset Manager 20%**  
Symbol: FIKVX  
CUSIP: **316069418**  
ISIN: US3160694184  
Inception Date: 10/4/2018  
Net Assets: \$5,547,491,000.00 as of 10/17/2022  
Portfolio Assets: \$5,547,491,000.00 as of 10/17/2022

Your CUSIP Results are as follows:

**JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (CC 2:19-CR-00877-CCC)**  
**PIMCO StocksPLUS Small Fund**  
Symbol: PCKAX  
CUSIP: **72201F698**  
ISIN: US72201F6988  
Inception Date: 3/25/2009  
Net Assets: \$1,316,629,000.00 as of 10/16/2022  
Portfolio Assets: \$1,316,629,000.00 as of 10/16/2022

3. United States Inc. federal corporation is hereby noticed, for a second time, that they are in violation of the prohibited uses of the Service Mark which is currently being used by them for commercial gain, and therefore, they agree:

- A. To be subject to the *Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement*, Form #06.027; <https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranchInjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>.
- B. Waive official, judicial, and sovereign immunity.
- C. Whatever terms are specified by Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks (me) for the beneficial use of the Service Mark. I'm happy to contract with you if you would like to use the service mark. I charge the following for each use:
  - i. All taxes owed by the service mark plus.
  - ii. All penalties and interest, plus.
  - iii. 100 Bitcoins for each use of it.
  - iv. That the person using service mark becomes the substitute surety for any public offices and obligations attached to it by them or their employer.
  - v. The invoice is in the exhibits. Payment is due immediately!

## **7. EXPLANATION OF WHY CIVIL STATUTORY STATUSES SUCH AS “PERSON” ARE PUBLIC OFFICERS**

1. As we learned above, a public officer is legally defined as someone in charge of the PROPERTY of the public.
2. As bare minimum, the PROPERTY connected to the office is the status of the office itself, such as CIVIL STATUTORY “person”, “taxpayer”, “citizen”, “resident”, “individual”, etc. Of which I am none!
3. Both RIGHTS and corresponding OBLIGATIONS attach to all civil statutory offices, except for that of “nonresident alien” defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B). **That status is actually a NON-DEFINITION because it describes what it is NOT, but never what it is.** How interesting... Did I discover, while being illegally detained in the law library for 5 years, a glitch in the Matrix? The Achilles Heel of this scam embedded in the code? I believe so. See: *Sometimes People Won’t Name Things Just So They Don’t Become Real*; <https://sedm.org/sometimes-people-wont-name-things-just-so-they-dont-become-real/>.
4. Civil statutory offices such as “person” and “taxpayer” are created by the Legislative Branch. That act of creation makes the Legislature the absolute owner of these civil statuses, and all rights and obligations (property) attached to the status within the civil statutes which implement it.

*“The distinction between public rights and private rights has not been definitively explained in our precedents. Nor is it necessary to do so in the present cases, for it suffices to observe that a matter of public rights must at a minimum arise “between the government and others.” Ex parte Bakelite Corp., *supra*, at 451, 49 S.Ct., at 413. In contrast, “the liability of one individual to another under the law as defined,” *Crowell v. Benson*, *supra*, at 51, 52 S.Ct., at 292, is a matter of private rights. Our precedents clearly establish that only controversies in the former category may be removed from Art. III courts and delegated to*

legislative courts or administrative agencies for their determination. See *Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm'n*, 430 U.S. 442, 450, n. 7, 97 S.Ct. 1261, 1266, n. 7, 51 L.Ed.2d. 464 (1977); *Crowell v. Benson*, *supra*, 285 U.S., at 50-51, 52 S.Ct., at 292. See also *Katz, Federal Legislative Courts*, 43 Harv.L.Rev. 894, 917-918 (1930).FN24 Private-rights disputes, on the other hand, lie at the core of the historically recognized judicial power."

[. . .]

Although *Crowell* and *Raddatz* do not explicitly distinguish between rights created by Congress [PUBLIC RIGHTS] and other [PRIVATE] rights, such a distinction underlies in part *Crowell's* and *Raddatz'* recognition of a critical difference between rights created by federal statute and rights recognized by the Constitution. Moreover, such a distinction seems to us to be necessary in light of the delicate accommodations required by the principle of separation of powers reflected in Art. III. The constitutional system of checks and balances is designed to guard against "encroachment or aggrandizement" by Congress at the expense of the other branches of government. *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S., at 122, 96 S.Ct., at 683. But when Congress creates a statutory right [a "privilege" or "public right" in this case, such as a "trade or business"], it clearly has the discretion, in defining that right, to create presumptions, or assign burdens of proof, or prescribe remedies; it may also provide that persons seeking to vindicate that right must do so before particularized tribunals created to perform the specialized adjudicative tasks related to that right. Such provisions do, in a sense, affect the exercise of judicial power, but they are also incidental to Congress' power to define the right that it has created. No comparable justification exists, however, when the right being adjudicated is not of congressional creation. In such a situation, substantial inroads into functions that have traditionally been performed by the Judiciary cannot be characterized merely as incidental extensions of Congress' power to define rights that it has created. Rather, such inroads suggest unwarranted encroachments upon the judicial power of the United States, which our Constitution reserves for Art. III courts.

[*Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co.*, 458 U.S. 50, 102 S.Ct. 2858 (1983)]

5. Those VOLUNTARILY FILLING a legislatively created and government owned civil statutory public office (such as "person" or "taxpayer" or "citizen") owe a CIVIL OBLIGATION to the public. That civil statutory obligation, IN FACT, is THE ONLY REASON WHY they can be called public officers if they have not otherwise injured someone. That obligation also constitutes a corresponding RIGHT on the part of the government that it is owed to. Rights and obligations are two sides of the same coin.

"The term 'office' has no legal or technical meaning attached to it, distinct from its ordinary acceptations. An office is a public charge or employment; but, as every employment is not an office, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between employments which are and those which are not offices....A public officer is one who has some duty to perform concerning the public; and he is not the less a public officer when his duty is confined to narrow limits, because it is the duty, and the nature of that duty, which makes him a public officer, and not the extent of his authority.' 7 Bac. Abr. 280; Carth. 479.... Where an employment or duty is a continuing one, which is defined by rules prescribed by law and not by contract, such a charge or employment is an office, and the person who performs it is an officer....

[*Ricker's Petition*, 66 N.H. 207 (1890)]

6. Franchises or privileges and the excise taxes that implement them, such as the income tax, are always implemented with public offices. "Taxpayers", in fact, are officers within the national but not state government, who are forbidden by state

constitutions from also holding a state office. That is why the income tax as an excise tax is imposed upon the “trade or business” franchise which is defined as “the function of a public office” in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26).

*“Is it a franchise? A franchise is said to be a right reserved to the people by the constitution, as the elective franchise. Again, it is said to be a privilege conferred by grant from government, and vested in one or more individuals, as a public office. Corporations, or bodies politic are the most usual franchises known to our laws.”*

[*People v. Ridgley, 21 Ill. 65, 1859 WL 6687, 11 Peck 65 (Ill., 1859)*]

---

26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)

***“The term ‘trade or business’ includes the performance of the functions of a public office.”***

7. By default, Congress CANNOT, per the Supreme Court, create NEW or TAXABLE public offices, and therefore excise taxable franchise or privileges, within the geographical boundaries of the constitutional state. HOWEVER, there is NO GEOGRAPHICAL LIMIT to the jurisdiction to tax among the legally ignorant who file the wrong tax return, the 1040, like the ones described upon whom I placed a criminal complaint later in Section 8.

*“Congress cannot authorize a trade or business [public office franchise] within a State in order to tax it.”*

[*License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)*]

8. We must remember, however, that:

- A. Even among those who consent in states of the Union to commit the crimes associated with filing a Form 1040 instead of the correct Form 1040NR, NO ONE in the government has the authority to enforce the rights illegally procured through such consent, including this court. It is a maxim of law, “that no one can benefit from an illegal act”.
- B. You can’t alienate or consent to give up rights that are unalienable per the Constitution and Declaration of Independence, BOTH of which are organic law published on the FIRST PAGE of the Statutes At Large. Judge Andrew Napolitano says that because of this, the Declaration of Independence is THE MOST FREQUENTLY VIOLATED law ever created.

Now, I was fortunate to have a father who was an American history and economics professor. He taught me apologetics. He explained to me how our history has been rewritten so that not too many people today know what has happened over the years. **I’d be willing to bet that not one person on the prosecution team has spent 10 hours a day for 10 years straight reading the 250,000 pages of the Statutes at Large.** If I’m correct, that means they don’t actually know the law and I’m certain they don’t know the true history of our country either. They have been compartmentalized and indoctrinated. They only know what the BAR club allows them to know. They haven’t

cracked the code... and thus, they are useful idiots... For if they had cracked the code, and they are decent people, then they would quit their jobs like all the other agents who figure out they are working for a criminal cabal. Decent people would never participate in this massive misprision of many felonies, throwing innocent members/victims of a Private Membership Association (PMA), like myself, in jail without a jury first convicting me of a crime at trial. It's beneath human dignity for them to do so. *Father forgive them for they know not what they do...* or do you persecutors know and yet believe that God/karma isn't going to do anything about your evil deeds? He promises that he will in Nahum 1:3 "*The Lord is slow to anger but great in power. **He will NOT leave the guilty unpunished!***" I wouldn't want to be the prosecution team come judgement day! Remember, crimes against humanity have no statutes of limitations. If I were you, I would drop the charges now for lack of evidence, lack of victims and lack of jurisdiction and start following the law of the land!

Well, after reading this far, the persecutors know for sure what they have been doing... I have forgiven them for what they have put me and my family through. I now move the court to dismiss this case for the benefit of the beneficiary and leave me alone. **Remember, when a man, who is honestly mistaken, hears the truth, he will either quit being mistaken, or quit being honest...** (or he will act like anarchists and pretend he didn't hear it, didn't read it, or forgot it to avoid his responsibility to love his neighbor). Pretended ignorance and plausible deniability is the only thing keeping the prosecutors out of jail, because you can't have "mens rea" without knowledge. Well, now they know. What a predicament they are in. Since the persecutors, up until now, didn't know the law, and claim ignorance to the crimes they are engaging in, how then can you expect the average Joe to know the law? Isn't that the very definition of what an "idiot" is? Idiot = A private person who doesn't know the law. Wouldn't that make EVERYONE an "idiot"? Does this court prosecute "idiots"?

See: [Are you an idiot? https://sedm.org/are-you-an-idiot-we-are/](https://sedm.org/are-you-an-idiot-we-are/)

C. Therefore, what I'm saying and the law that I'm quoting in this brief is probably completely new to most everyone reading this. It's difficult to get a compartmentalized lawyer to understand something, when his salary depends on him not understanding it. If the lawyers don't understand their own law, than how is the average Joe supposed to know it? You can get a college degree and never have to take a class on law.

D. It's the same with history. For instance, most people have no idea that we had 10 presidents of the United States before George Washington. See [www.ForgottenFounders.org](http://www.ForgottenFounders.org) Most people don't know that the **Supreme Court** in Hooven Allison v. Evatt, 324 US 652 (1945) gave us 3 different definitions of 3 different "United States". My own lawyers, who used to be prosecutors, didn't even know this! That was one of the reasons I had to fire them! In the 250,000 pages of statutes, it mentions "The United States" a bunch of times. Don't you think it would be wise to know which United States they are talking about? Hello?

E. Those who do know, just use equivocation and presumptions and never define their terms in order to **deceive**.

Everyone else is compartmentalized. They just follow orders and procedures, and do what they are told, like “useful idiots” as the communists call them. Those who have been initiated with this secret, hidden knowledge, look at the rest of us like we are dumbed down cows, ready to be milked, on the government ranch. The prosecutors either know the law and are a party to the crimes mentioned above or they don’t know the law and are misapplying it, as in my case, causing me and my loved one’s injury. Either way, after reading this, their plausible deniability excuse is over and “mens rea” kicks in. Does anyone in the department of justice have the courage to stand up against these massive crimes that are taking place against millions of innocent Americans or is everyone in the DOJ compromised and compartmentalized? First, we overlook evil. Then we permit evil. Then we legalize evil. Then we promote evil. Then we celebrate evil. Then we persecute those who still call it evil. This evil literally amounts to treason punishable by execution in 18 U.S.C. §2381. This matter will be brought to the attention of Vice Admiral Darse E. Crandall, who oversees the prosecution of high treason against the American people, if I am not dismissed from this case immediately... I will have remedy!

## **8. CONCLUSIONS**

1. As a responsible American:

- A. I’d like to make things right if I caused anyone harm.
- B. I’d like to know who I harmed.
- C. I’d like to confront my accuser and
- D. I demand this case dismissed. I’m tired of living in limbo and having a cadre of cannibal legal vultures feeding on my carcass while I’m still alive, extending this case needlessly and endlessly to make their Mercedes payments, house payments or pay for their fat retirement check. Enough already. Its been 5 years and still no end in sight.

2. To date, I have not been notified by the Prosecution that any aspect of my behavior that is the subject of this proceeding has injured any specific protected person, and/or that I was the direct cause of the damaging behavior.

- A. If I had, I would have already compensated that person without even being asked to do so and before trial. That is how I run my entire life, in fact.
- B. A failure to disclose to me who has been injured before trial, and to prove that I am the cause of the injury is merely delaying justice and promoting needless litigation before this court and unjustly enriching all the legal professionals so involved.

C. Remember, when you look at the defective indictment and the final pre-sentence report you can see that I wasn't indicted for tax "crimes", and that the two things that the trust was indicted for, wire fraud (isn't even mentioned in the report because it was a bogus charge to begin with) and supposedly selling an unregistered security. Something that 1 million other Bitclub members were also doing. (Selective enforcement is illegal) The government admits in their own document that I caused no harm to anyone, that I owe no restitution to be paid to any victims, and there were no complaints or victims accusing me of any wrong doing. They also admit that I was a perpetual traveler, with a domicile and citizenship in MEXICO! This is according to the government itself who did not object to their own document! It's on the record! And now, since I reversed/rescissioned the plea statement I gave under duress, the tax charge goes away because the trust wasn't indicted for taxes to begin with because I'm NOT an 8 USC 1401 US CITIZEN! Hello, I joined Bitclub as a Mexican from Mexico! It was a bogus "information"! So what do they have? **They have nothing!** They can't all of a sudden try to indict me for taxes knowing what they know! That would be illegal too! **The government literally just exonerated me in your own document!** If you guys still think I owe you "taxes", take it out of the Bitcoin you stole of mine, without due process, that I had stored on my **Silk Road** wallet. You stole 250 Bitcoins (\$25,000,000) from me and the equivalent of billions more from other innocent people like me, without due process, and then auctioned them off. Good for you. You sniveling thieves!

D. Is that NOT enough stolen loot for you to finally leave me alone? Do you still have an insatiable desire to steal even more property that isn't yours? Want another \$8 million? Why not make it \$80 million? See my "**Constructive Notice**" in the exhibits (another 3rd rail issue) and then go take it up with the Treasury. We have a contractual agreement that guarantees indemnification for the **JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS** (account) and **Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks** by the U.S. Department of the Treasury "from all liabilities, **charges, taxes**, liens, encumbrances, judgments, **true bills**, obligations of contracts of performance, defaults, and any and all obligations, pre-existing, current and future, and against any and all future Liabilities." Here is proof that The Treasury has been trading the bonds! There are the CUSIP numbers! Look it up yourself! Go play your "money game", offset the debits with the credits, (discharge) and then LEAVE ME ALONE! I DO NOT CONSENT FOR YOU TO CONTINUE TO HARASS ME!

Your CUSIP Results are as follows:Your CUSIP Results are as follows:

**JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (REG MAIL RE720-096-470US)**  
**American US Government Securities Fund**  
 Symbol: UGSCX  
 CUSIP: **026300301**  
 ISIN: **US0263003016**  
 Inception Date: 3/15/2001  
 Net Assets: \$22,238,592,000.00 as of 11/24/2024

**JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (ACCT JSW08251982 [DISCHARGE BOND])**  
**Goldman Sachs Strategic Income Fund**  
 Symbol: GSZCX  
 CUSIP: **38145C653**  
 ISIN: **US38145C6536**  
 Inception Date: 06/30/2010  
 Net Assets: \$ 857,162,000.00 as of 11/22/2024

**A little about the Fund:**

American U.S. Government Securities Fund seeks high level current income as well as to preserve your investment by investing in securities that are guaranteed by the U.S. government. The Fund also invests in securities sponsored by the U.S. government. All securities held by the fund will be rated AAA/Aaa.

Admin Notes: Always listed as a government security.

**A little about the Fund:**

Goldman Sachs Strategic Income Fund seeks total return comprised of income and capital appreciation by investing in a broadly diversified portfolio of U.S. and foreign investment grade and non-investment grade fixed income investments.

Admin Notes: Special tranche of US securities.

3. Throwing me in jail for 11 months and keeping me on house arrest for another 4+ years, for violating statutes that don't apply to me, or not paying a tax I don't owe as a nonresident alien not doing business within the statutory geographical "United States" (26 U.S.C. § 7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) and 4 U.S.C. §110(d)) or with the United States government, **is NOT justice.** Prison is a place for thieving criminals like the persecutors! Criminals are people who intentionally and willingly harm others and steal their property. **There was no "mens rea" or evil/criminal intent in my case.** There can be no evil intent where I have made it my passion by spending the last 15 years learning the law, from the likes of David Boies, so I can love my neighbor and not hurt anyone. My behavior is and always has been above reproach. Only those who profit from irresponsibly claiming otherwise, without evidence, on the public record (in violation of 18 U.S.C. §208, 28 U.S.C. §144, and 28 U.S.C. §455) would disagree. This may be why the Bible says the LOVE OF MONEY is the root of ALL evil: There appears to be many people in the legal profession who got into it because they seem to LOVE and COVET other people's money and property more than they love REAL justice... thus putting that property in jeopardy so they can charge exorbitant fees. You guys are criminals!

*"Many seek the ruler's favor [privileges and other people's property], But justice for man comes from the Lord [who is the OWNER of EVERYTHING and whose permission the government needs to get before they can use or benefit from]."*, Prov. 29:26.

4. I think we all know who is guilty of enslaving millions of innocent people using **equivocation, presumption, and words of art** upon a legally ignorant audience in order to deceive people into violating the law and misrepresenting their civil statutory status. It's the plaintiff! I shouldn't be faulted for reading the definitions within their own code and expecting the government to abide by them... Plus Common Law is above your statutes anyways! It's not me who is abusing legalese to deceive and enslave the masses or the jury or this Court! Instead, it's the persecutors who are doing it. They are

“anarchists” because they are trying to exceed and defy their delegation order, the Constitution, on behalf of their international bankster creditors. Well, I’m a creditor too! These sadistic anarchists (the persecutors/plaintiff), on behalf of these creditors, are literally launching a stealth attack from the imposter, bankrupt, de facto corporate “United States” based in what Mark Twain called “The District of Criminals” to invade the states of the union commercially by abusing franchises in violation of Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution and the License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866) (which has never been overruled). They have to since the USA Inc. went bankrupt in 1933, expressed in Roosevelt’s Executive Orders 6073, 6102, 6111, and 6260 and House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5, 1933 confirmed in Perry v. U.S., 294 U.S. 330-381, 79 LEd 912 (1935). This commercial invasion leads to an official, judicial, and sovereign immunity **waver** against the government and all its officers so engaged in connection with all such unconstitutional activities. These activities CLEARLY fall within the anarchist definition, (The enemies of the Republic from within) and were described by the U.S. Supreme Court as follows:

*“Decency, security, and liberty alike demand that government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the citizen. In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself: it invites anarchy. To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means-to declare that the government may commit crimes in order to secure the conviction of a private criminal-would bring terrible retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine this court should resolutely set its face.”*

*[Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928)]*

5. Why do I bring this up? Well, at the bail hearing, the Prosecution inappropriately accused me on the court record of being an anarchist. A stigmatized label commonly used in order to **dehumanize** me to the general public. However, they never defined what an anarchist is... For the record, I am NOT an anarchist. Yah, the creator, calls me to love my neighbor, and you don’t hurt people you love. Taking responsibility for hurting people is the very foundation of the common law, which I am subject to whether I consent to it or not, because a HIGHER law calls me to be subject to it: Yah, the creator’s law. An anarchist is someone with NO RULERS, including Yah.

*Main Entry: an·ar·chy*

*Function: noun*

*Etymology: Medieval Latin anarchia, from Greek, from anarchos having no ruler, from an- + archos ruler -- more at ARCH-*

*[Merriam Webster Dictionary: Anarchy]*

6. As our Founding Fathers used to say: No King but King Jesus! (Yahshua) (<https://www.youtube.com/embed/9351KGbkDrc>). Under my biblical delegation of authority, my ONLY AUTHORIZED civil ruler is Yah, the creator and I am forbidden from serving TWO masters or “rulers”, so I can’t have a secular government cult above me as a CIVIL ruler without violating my First Amendment right to practice my religion. However, I do have earthly “rules” to follow, but only within the confines of the common law and the criminal law within the Constitutional state I am currently in. Right

now, I am subject to Yah, the creator's law, the common law, (do no harm to others or their property) and the criminal law in that order of priority. That means I CAN'T be an "anarchist" as the prosecution alleges.

7. The criminal statutes cited against the JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS trust to which I illegally plead guilty, under duress but didn't violate, are actually quasi-criminal, because they are based on a civil statutory status and the civil office (of "person") that I never consented to and which is therefore slavery in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment to enforce the obligations of the office against me as a nonresident. I have to expressly consent to the office and the domicile it attaches to within the exclusive jurisdiction of the granting government of the CIVIL STATUTORY protection franchise. Anything that acquires the "force of law" directly, or indirectly in this case, through my consent, is quasi-criminal and in effect is a property crime, wherein an office as property is misused. Violations of quasi-criminal statutes are penal violations under the franchise/compact agreement rather than de jure criminal violations under the common law or Yah/God, our creator's law. That, by the way, is why 26 U.S.C. §7201 statute I plead to under duress is found in Title 26 (civil) instead of Title 18, which is the criminal code that you learned above wasn't even properly enacted into positive law to begin with!
8. More on the subject of "anarchy", at:

*Problems with Atheistic Anarchism*, Form #08.020;

<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/ProbsWithAtheistAnarchism.pdf>

9. I have consistently demonstrated throughout this proceeding and my entire life a sincere effort to learn and obey the laws that apply to me, to avoid government obligations that require me to consent in some form, and to act responsibly and respectfully with everyone I deal with in the government and the business world. Sometimes I get frustrated and irritated with these central banksters who are bent on turning humanity into debt slaves and conquering the planet with full spectrum domination, committing inter-dimensional crimes. Christ lost his temper with the money changers in the temple too. Same with Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson. I don't like to see innocent people needlessly suffer and become enslaved. Time for a Jubilee?! You evil **usurious** "rulers" don't have much time until society turns on you! Better do it quick! I've always stood up for the little guy my entire life. I don't like bullies. The DOJ persecutors are bullies. The Bible in Hosea 4:6 says that "*My people perish because of lack of knowledge*". The Bible also, specifically commands us in Rev. 18:4 to: "*Come out of her, My people, so that you will not share in her sins or contract any of her plagues.*" I left the Babylonian civil statutory "sand box" and exited the matrix long ago as Yah, our creator commands. My biblical trust indenture with Yah, our creator, **will not allow me serve two masters**. I can't be a trustee of both the Kingdom of Heaven and the Kingdom of Darkness at the same time. I choose to live my life in Yah, our creator's "sand box" under his law, as his trustee instead of living and working in Satan's civil statutory "sand box". I want nothing to do with this Babylonian slavery system. Daniel got thrown into the lion's den. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego got tossed into a fiery furnace and we all know what happened. Yah, our creator has been known protect those who love, worship and obey him. 2

Timothy 4:8 “in the future there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will award to me on that day; and not only to me, but also to all who have loved His appearing.” I’d rather be on Gods side than on Pharaohs side. God will judge us all, including pharaoh and his minions. i.e. You persecutors will not be able to escape it! Matt 7:1 “Judge not, lest ye be judged.” You cannot force me to bow down and worship/obey the Devil, “working” as a U.S. agency cardholder trustee and get the mark of the beast against my will and consent. Yahshua (Jesus) said in 1 John 2:15 “Do not love the world or anything in the world. If anyone loves the world, love for the Father<sup>at</sup> is not in them.” In John 15:19 he says, “If you belonged to the world, it would love you as its own. As it is, you do not belong to the world, but I have chosen you out of the world. That is why the world hates you.” This is the essence of what it means to practice my religion, to be in the world but not of the world, which is protected in the 1st Amendment. I’m not surprised that the prosecutors hate private harmless people like me. They want to drag me into their ritualistic, Satanic secular humanist religion, where the government is god, the statutory “creator”, the gate (BAR) is the veil, the bench is the alter, their scripture is the code, their foreign BAR member “attorneys/actors” are the deacons and mediators, their temple/synagogue is the court house, where they “summon” the dead fictions of law... as the BAAL-if conjures the entities to “all rise” to “make an appearance” when the high priest in a black robe enters the ship, looking down on their human sacrifice “persons” wearing a mask... in chains below... Then the ritual begins... Worship and obey... the state/beast... I’m not interested in joining your religion. I thought we were supposed to have a separation of church and state. Seems the government has created its own religion, has it not? If it looks like a duck and acts like a duck and quacks like a duck, it’s probably a duck. For exhaustive proof that there is in fact a state-sponsored religion in violation of the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), 42 U.S.C. Chapter 21B, see:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SocialismCivilReligion.pdf>

10. You might be tempted to rationalize further injustice by alleging “gamesmanship” in some aspect of this pleading.

**However, real “gamesmanship” at its heart is a desire to avoid responsibility for the damage one causes to others. I have never done that and am not doing it now.** I even promise to make my involvement in this proceeding unnecessary if you would just satisfy the burden of proof upon the government to demonstrate EXACTLY and SPECIFICALLY who was injured by any aspect of the exercise of my authority and control over ONLY myself and my private property, since I was NOT a decision maker or officer of Bitclub at any time who could have prevented the harm which is alleged in the defective, illegitimate indictment.

11. Lastly, **it is my DUTY as a law abiding living man, to report the fraud happening on a large scale at the IRS/DOJ and even in this courtroom every single day.** Most Americans are incorrectly, illegally, and even criminally being tricked into filing the wrong tax return, the IRS Form 1040, amongst other things... It is the duty of this Court to report and punish

all such crimes, and it is likely most of the people on the jury have committed and probably are currently and unknowingly committing these crimes. The exhaustive evidence of said crimes are laid out in the following, and misprision of a felony by the Prosecution and this court will result if they are not reported or prosecuted. There it is, in black and white. Please don't shoot the messenger. ☺

Why It's a Crime for a Private state national to File a 1040 Income Tax Return, Form #08.021

<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/WhyCrimefileReturn.pdf> Silence is agreement. Read and rebut if you disagree.

## 9. AFFIRMATION

1. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the Republic of (but not "State of") Colorado from without the "United States" defined in, 26 U.S.C. §§7701(a)(9) and (a)(10), and 4 U.S.C. §110(d) and only when litigated under the common law with the following conditions, first, I am NOT suicidal and second that the foregoing facts, exhibits, and statements made by me are true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge and ability in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1746(1).
  - A. If we have a trial by jury (not to be confused as a "jury trial") these are the lawful terms.
  - B. First, you need a natural person (a witness who has standing) to file a complaint/tort against me and then the prosecution needs to properly indict me the living man, not the trust, by a jury of my peers, in a common law article III court. (Good luck with that!)
  - C. Second, no jurist or judge may be a STATUTORY "U.S. citizen" under 8 U.S.C. §1401, 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c), or a "taxpayer" under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14) because of the financial conflict of interest this creates in this case. Remember, I'm supposed to have an impartial judge (referee) and jury (of my peers)! As it stands right now, the judge should either dismiss this case or recuse herself because of a conflict of interest. No one on the grand jury or petite jury is my peer and most are probably on the government dole in one way or another.
  - D. No jurist may be in receipt of any federal financial or other benefit or employment, or office nor maintain a domicile on federal property. Otherwise, they have a conflict of interest too.
  - E. Any judge who receives retirement or employment benefits derived from Subtitle A of the I.R.C. must recuse herself in judging the law and defer to the jury instead, as required under 18 U.S.C. §208, 28 U.S.C. §144, and 28 U.S.C. §455. Samuel Chase, US Supreme Court Justice said, "*The Jury has the right to determine both the LAW itself and the facts.*" Thomas Jefferson said: "*I consider trial by jury as the only anchor ever yet imagined by man, by which a government can be held accountable to the principles of its Constitution.*"

F. At trial, IF you can jump through those hoops, after I affirm to “tell the truth, the WHOLE truth and nothing but the truth” will the judge respect my right to explain to the jury of my peers what “Jury Nullification” is? Is telling the jury the truth, that they are above the law, above the prosecutor and above the judge herself allowed? And if not, then why would you want me to swear to tell the whole truth and then deny me that opportunity and thereby SANCTION criminal subornation of the witness oath in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1622? **That’s called tampering with the witness, judge.** Obviously, a jury of my peers would already know what jury nullification is. We the People (via the jury) are above the entire government itself as “the State”. The “government” and the “State” are NOT synonymous, as the U.S. Supreme Court has concluded in *Poindexter v. Greenhow*, 114 U.S. 270 (1884). The people are the master, and the government is our servant. One juror has more power than the President of the United States. One juror has more power than all 435 members of Congress. A single juror has more power than all 100 Senators and all 9 Supreme Court justices combined!! One juror has VETO power to strike down unjust, unconstitutional statutes that are being illegally enforced, like Title 15, Title 18 and Title 26. (Amongst others!) That juror can veto these unconstitutional statutes and codes with no permission from anyone. And it only takes one juror to agree with me! Do you think it would be hard for me to convince and enlighten one juror of the massive fraud that has been taking place? **Our grand jury and trial jury votes are the most important votes we can make.** It’s how “we the people” can keep a corrupt communist government that doesn’t follow the constitution in check. Especially when the prosecutors allow our general election “votes” to be compromised with easily hackable electronic voting machines. (See documentaries, Uncounted, Hacking Democracy, Invisible Ballots and 2000 mules.) Stalin said, “*It doesn’t matter who you vote for... what matters is who counts the votes.*” I trust eating Milk Duds off a toilet seat in a dive bar in Tijuana more than I do our elections... Since our votes are being diluted, just like our currency, it’s imperative to preserve jury nullification. The jury should acquit people incorrectly charged with victimless “crimes” like the JOBADIAH WEEKS (trust) is being charged with! Remember, this proceeding is in REM against the RES. I, the living man, should be dismissed from this case. Follow the law and dismiss this case!

G. The original jurisdiction constitutional republic “United States of America” is a society of **sovereigns** without subjects (except for government officers who voluntarily work for “we the people”). “...while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts.” *Yick Wo vs Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886). Government officers work for us, not the other way around. I’d like to “respectfully” remind the prosecutors to know and remember their place. And to the judge, do you recognize this FACT or will you mislead the jurors to the detriment of your own posterity as well? Seriously, do you want your grandkids to end up as micro chipped “social credit score” slaves of this evil banking cabal and their central bank digital currencies? If not, then why do you all want to ruin the life of the guy who wants to make sure your

grandkids live free? If you don't notify the jury that they have the power to nullify these unconstitutional statutes and alert them that I, the private man, am NOT subject to them to begin with, then you are on the wrong side of history your honor. Alexander Hamilton said, "*Jurors should acquit even against the judge's instructions... if exercising their judgment with discretion and honesty they have a clear conviction that the charge of the court is wrong.*" The U.S. Court of Appeals for D.C. said, "*The pages of history shine on instances of the jury's exercise of its prerogative to disregard instructions of the judge*" in U.S v. Dougherty, 473 F.2d. 1113 (1972).

The jury will read this affidavit at trial, however, it may be easier and less embarrassing for the plaintiff to just drop the charges and the judge dismiss me from this case, so that the uninformed, sadistic persecutors and their central bankster over lords can continue to keep this trillion-dollar fraudulent cash cow scam going on against innocent Americans for the foreseeable future. Dismissing the alleged but not actual Defendant from this case would avoid a high maintenance, hostile witness and would keep the case "revenue neutral", saving taxpayer money and effort, wouldn't you agree? If the rest of the people in this country are too lazy to read the law and figure the scam that you guys are pulling out for themselves and would prefer to be slaves, fine, fleece them. But don't try to enslave me. This is America not China! Why do the prosecutors need years and years and years to put together a frivolous case that makes innocent people look guilty when I can prove my innocence, using the constitution, and maxims of law, in less than an hour, on the stand, in front of a jury of my peers? If you can even put together a jury made up of private, well-informed Americans who know the law, like me. (You know, my peers...) John 8:32 says, "*And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free!*" I know the truth, so, let's get this over with. What's it going to be? Dismiss me from this case or lawfully start this process all over again? Remember, these codes and statutes you claim I broke don't even apply to private people like me. They only apply to "statutory persons." The truth is still truth even if nobody believes it and a lie is still a lie even if everyone believes it. Now please dismiss me from this case and return my property to me. My wife has stage 4 cancer (a tumor the size of a baseball in her uterus) and the treatments she needs are expensive. This fiasco has put our family through hell for the last five years. Enough! Thank you.

2. Non-acceptance of this affirmation or refusal to admit all evidence attached to this notice into the record by the court shall constitute withdrawal of consent to make a general appearance or submit myself to the jurisdiction of this foreign court and foreign state. This affirmation is an extension of my right to contract which is guaranteed under Article 1, Section 10 of the United States Constitution and may not be interfered with by any court of the United States.

1/21/25

Dated:

Jobadiah S. Weeks  
Sui Juris, man


All rights reserved, U.C.C. §1-308

NOTARY:

DANA JENSEN



JAN. 21, 2025



MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 20, 2027

STATE OF: COLORADO

COUNTY OF: JEFFERSON

Case No: *19-cr-877-CCC In the Admiralty*

The above-entitled cause came on for hearing before this court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
\_\_\_\_\_, 202\_\_\_.

IT IS ORDERED, ABJUDGED AND DECREED that this cause of action is DISMISSED with prejudice.

SO, ORDERED.

SIGNED on this the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 202\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Judge

ENTERED on this the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 202\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk

Case No. *19-cr-877-CCC*